arXiv:1604.05440v1 [math.PR] 19 Apr 2016

RANDOM WALKS AND INDUCED DIRICHLET FORMS ON SELF-SIMILAR SETS

SHI-LEI KONG, KA-SING LAU and TING-KAM LEONARD WONG

Abstract

Let K be a self-similar set with the open set condition. It is known that there is a naturally defined augmented tree structure $\mathfrak{E}$ on the symbolic space X of K that is hyperbolic, and the hyperbolic boundary $\partial_H X$ with the Gromov metric is Hölder equivalent to K ([Ka], [LW1,3]). In the paper we consider certain reversible random walks with return ratio $0 < \lambda < 1$ on $(X, \mathfrak{E})$. We show that the Martin boundary $\mathcal{M}$ can be identified with $\partial_H X$ and K. With this setup and a device of Silverstein [Si], we are able to obtain precise estimates of the Martin kernel and the Naim kernel in terms of the Gromov product, and the Naim kernel turns out to be a jump kernel $\Theta(\xi, \eta) \asymp |\xi - \eta|^{-(\alpha+\beta)}$ where α is the Hausdorff dimension of K and β depends on λ. For suitable β, the kernel defines a non-local Dirichlet form on K. This extends a consideration of Kigami in [Ki2], where he investigated random walks on the binary trees with Cantor type sets as boundaries.

Contents

1 Introduction · · · · · 2
2 Preliminaries · · · · · 7
3 Self-similar sets and augmented trees · · · · · 10
4 Constant return ratio and quasi-natural RW · · · · · 17
5 Martin boundary and hitting distribution · · · · · 25
6 Estimation of the Naim kernel · · · · · 31

Date: Apr 3, 2016

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 28A80, 60J10; Secondary 60J50.

Keywords: Dirichlet form, hyperbolic graph, hyperbolic boundary, iterated function system, Martin boundary, Naim kernel, self-similar set, open set condition, random walk

The research is supported in part by the HKRGC grant and the NNSF of China (no. 11371382).

7 Induced Dirichlet forms 35

1 Introduction

Let $\mathbb{D}$ be the open unit disk, and $\mathbb{T}$ the boundary circle parameterized by $\{\theta : 0 \le \theta < 2\pi\}$. Let

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{D}}(u,v) = \int_{\mathbb{D}} \nabla u(x)\nabla v(x)dx \tag{1.1}$$

be the standard Dirichlet form on $\mathbb{D}$. In classical analysis, it is well-known that a function $\varphi \in L^1(\mathbb{T})$ can be extended to a harmonic functions on $\mathbb{D}$ by the Poisson integral

$$(H\varphi)(x) = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \varphi(\theta)K(x,\theta)d\theta, \qquad x \in \mathbb{D},$$

where $K(x,\theta)$ is the Poisson kernel. Furthermore, there is an induced Dirichlet form on $\mathbb{T}$ defined by

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{T}}(\varphi,\psi) = \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{D}}(H\varphi, H\psi).$$

It is not difficult to show that

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{T}}(\varphi,\psi) = \frac{1}{16\pi}\int_{\mathbb{T}}\int_{\mathbb{T}}(\varphi(\theta)-\varphi(\theta'))(\psi(\theta)-\psi(\theta'))\ \frac{1}{\sin^2(\frac{\theta-\theta'}{2})}\ d\theta d\theta'. \tag{1.2}$$

The integral is called the *Douglas integral* (see [FOT], Section 1.2). From the probabilistic point of view, the Dirichlet form in (1.1) is associated with a Brownian motion on $\mathbb{D}$. The hitting distribution of the Brownian motion starting from 0 and hitting the boundary $\mathbb{T}$ is the uniform distribution $\frac{d\theta}{2\pi}$; the induced Dirichlet form in (1.2) is the reflecting Brownian motion on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ time-changed by its local time on $\mathbb{T}$, and defines a jump process on $\mathbb{T}$ which is a Cauchy process [CF].

The above consideration has a counterpart in Markov chain theory. Let $\{Z_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ be a transient Markov chain on an infinite discrete set X with transition probability P. According to the discrete potential theory of Markov chains (see e.g., [Dy], [Wo1,2]), the chain starting at the reference point ϑ will walk to the *Martin boundary* $\mathcal{M}$ at infinity, and defines a hitting distribution $\nu = \nu_\vartheta$ on $\mathcal{M}$; there is a Martin kernel $K(x,\xi),\ x \in X, \xi \in \mathcal{M}$, which plays the same role as the Poisson kernel,

$$(H\varphi)(x) = \int_{\mathcal{M}} \varphi(\xi)K(x,\xi)d\nu(\xi), \qquad x \in X,$$

and $u = H\varphi$ is harmonic on X, i.e., $u = Pu$. We call a Markov chain *reversible* if the transition probability is of the form $P(x,y) = c(x,y)/m(x)$, where $c(x,y) = c(y,x) \ge 0$, and $m(x) = \sum_{y\in X} c(x,y)$. We define a graph energy $\mathcal{E}_X$ on X by

$$\mathcal{E}_X[u] = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{x,y\in X} c(x,y)|u(x)-u(y)|^2. \tag{1.3}$$

In [Si], Silverstein showed that for such a Markov chain, there is an energy form $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{M}}$ on $\mathcal{M}$ that satisfies

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{M}}[\varphi] = \mathcal{E}_X[H\varphi] \ ,$$

and $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{M}}$ has the expression

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{M}}[\varphi] = \int_{\mathcal{M}} \int_{\mathcal{M}} |\varphi(\xi) - \varphi(\eta)|^2 \ \Theta(\xi, \eta) \ d\nu(\theta) d\nu(\theta'). \tag{1.4}$$

Here $\Theta(\cdot, \cdot)$ is called the *Naim kernel* [Na]. The domain of $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{M}}$ is those φ such that $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{M}}[\varphi] < \infty$. If the domain is dense in $L^2(\mathcal{M}, \nu)$, then $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{M}}$ defines a non-local Dirichlet form.

In the analysis of fractals, there is a large literature in the study of local and non-local Dirichlet forms as well as the associated heat kernels on self-similar sets, d-sets and more general metric measure spaces (cf [CF], [CK], [GHL1,2], [J], [Ki1,2], [P1,2], [St] and the references therein). A non-local form can be obtained by subordination of a local form, and has a jump kernel of the form $|\xi - \eta|^{-(\alpha+\beta)}$ asymptotically, where α is the Hausdorff dimension of the underlying set and β is the walk dimension of the corresponding stable-like process ([St], [CK]).

For a self-similar set K generated by an iterated function system (IFS), it has a symbolic space (coding space) Σ^* which gives a convenient representation of $\xi \in K$. If the IFS satisfies the *open set condition* (OSC), then this representation is unique for generic points in K. Recently, there are studies of random walks on Σ^* such that that K can be identified with the Martin boundary $\mathcal{M}$ under the canonical homeomorphism ([DS1,2,3], [JLW], [LN1,2], [LW2]). In this paper we will study random walks and their induced Dirichlet forms on K using the approach of Silverstein. We investigate a class of reversible random walks on Σ^* so that

(i) the self-similar set K is identified with the Martin boundary, and

(ii) the hitting distribution $\nu = \nu_\vartheta$ is the normalized Hausdorff measure on K, and the Naim kernel is $|\xi - \eta|^{-(\alpha+\beta)}$ asymptotically.

For a specific case, Kigami [Ki2] studied certain reversible random walk on certain trees, where the Martin boundaries are Cantor-type sets K. He used the resistance metric to give explicit expressions of the hitting distribution ν and the Martin kernel $K(x, y)$. Also, under the volume doubling property of ν with respect to the resistance metric, he considered the associated jump process and the asymptotic behavior of the heat kernel on K.

Let $\{S_i\}_{i=1}^N$ denote an IFS of contractive similitudes, and let K denote the self-similar set generated. To simplify notations in this introduction, we only state the case the IFS is *homogenous* (it has equal contraction ratio r). Following the standard

notation, we let $\Sigma = \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$, $\Sigma^n = \{\mathbf{x} = i_1 \cdots i_n : i_1, \cdots, i_n \in \Sigma\}$, $n \geq 1$ (by convention $\Sigma^0 = \{\vartheta\}$) and use $|\mathbf{x}| = n$ to denote the length of $\mathbf{x}$; also we let $\Sigma^* := \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \Sigma^n$, the set of finite words, and $\Sigma^\infty := \{i_1 i_2 \cdots : \ i_1, i_2, \cdots \in \Sigma\}$, the set of infinite words. There is a natural surjection $\kappa : \Sigma^\infty \to K$ defined by

$$\{\kappa(\omega)\} = \bigcap\nolimits_{m \geq 0} S_{i_1 i_2 \cdots i_m}(K), \qquad \omega = i_1 i_2 \cdots \in \Sigma^\infty,$$

where $S_{i_1 i_2 \cdots i_m} = S_{i_1} \circ S_{i_2} \circ \cdots \circ S_{i_m}$. Hence each $\xi \in K$ admits a symbolic representation (coding) $\omega \in \Sigma^\infty$.

The symbolic space Σ^* has a natural tree structure $\mathfrak{E}_v$ (see (3.3)), which is referred to as the "vertical edges" . To consider (i), we need to enrich this simple graph by adding in more "horizontal edges", denoted by $\mathfrak{E}_h$, to reflect the behavior of the neighboring cells in K in each level :

$$(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathfrak{E}_h \text{ if } \mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{y}, \ |\mathbf{x}| = |\mathbf{y}| \text{ and } \inf_{\xi, \eta \in K} |S_{\mathbf{x}}(\xi) - S_{\mathbf{y}}(\eta)| \leq \gamma \cdot r^{|\mathbf{x}|} \tag{1.5}$$

where $\gamma > 0$ is any fixed constant (see (3.5)). We write $X_n = \bigcup_{j=1}^n \Sigma^j$, and $X = \Sigma^*$ for brevity, and let $\mathfrak{E} = \mathfrak{E}_v \cup \mathfrak{E}_h$. We call $(X, \mathfrak{E})$ the *augmented tree* of K. This notion was originated from Kaimanovich [Ka] (with the last condition replaced by $S_{\mathbf{x}}(K) \cap S_{\mathbf{y}}(K) \neq \emptyset$), and was investigated in detail in [LW1]. The modification here avoids some technicalities that arise, but does not change the boundary of the graph at infinity [LW3]. The setup allows us to bring in Gromov's hyperbolic graph consideration into our study: for a hyperbolic graph, there is a *Gromov product* $(x|y)$ for $x, y \in X$, a *Gromov metric* $\rho_a(x, y) = e^{-a(x|y)}$ on X, and a *hyperbolic boundary* $\partial_H X$ with $\rho_a(\cdot, \cdot)$ extended to $\partial_H X$ (see Section 3).

Theorem 1.1. [LW1,3] *For any IFS, the augmented tree $(X, \mathfrak{E})$ is hyperbolic. Moreover, there is a canonical identification $\iota : \partial_H X \to K$ (independent of $\gamma > 0$), such that K and $\partial_H X$ are Hölder equivalent, i.e., $\varrho_a(\xi, \eta) \asymp |\iota(\xi) - \iota(\eta)|^{-a/\log r}$.*

For a homogenous IFS $\{S_i\}_{i=1}^N$ satisfying the open set condition (OSC), the self-similar set has Hausdorff dimension $\alpha = \log N / |\log r|$. For $0 < \lambda < 1$, we define a class of random walks on $(X, \mathfrak{E})$ with conductance

$$c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^-) = (\lambda^{-1} r^\alpha)^{|\mathbf{x}|}, \qquad \mathbf{x} \in X.$$

and $c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \asymp c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^-)$ for $\mathbf{x} \sim_h \mathbf{y}$ where $\mathbf{x}^-$ is the parent of $\mathbf{x}$ (here $\asymp$ means the two terms dominate each other by two constants C_1, C_2 independent of the variables), and call it a *λ-natural random walk* (λ-NRW). This r^α corresponds to the natural weight $p_i = r^\alpha$ of the IFS $\{S_i\}_{i=1}^N$ in the iteration, which generates a self-similar measure on K that equals the normalized Hausdorff measure $\mathcal{H}^\alpha$ on

K; the parameter λ is the ratio of the probabilities for the walk to go backward or forward at each $\mathbf{x}$ (see (4.1) and Section 4). Note that a simple random walk (SRW) has transition probability

$$P(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) = \frac{1}{\deg(\mathbf{x})} \qquad \text{for} \quad \mathbf{x}\sim\mathbf{y}$$

where $\deg(\mathbf{x})$ is the number of edges at $\mathbf{x}$. It is easy to see that a SRW is a $1/N$-NRW with $c(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{x}^-) = c(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) = 1$ for $\mathbf{x}\in X$ and $\mathbf{x}\sim_h \mathbf{y}$. By using Theorem 1.1, and a well-known result of Ancona ([An1,2], [Wo1]) on uniformly irreducible random walks on hyperbolic graphs, we prove (Theorem 5.1).

Theorem 1.2. *Suppose in addition, the IFS satisfies the OSC, let $\{Z_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ be a λ-NRW on $(X,\mathfrak{E})$. Then the hyperbolic boundary $\partial_H X$, the Martin boundary $\mathcal{M}$ and the self-similar set K are all homeomorphic under the canonical mapping.*

The above theorem allows us to identify K with the two boundaries. Our main results involve the estimates of various key quantities of the λ-NRW on $(X,\mathfrak{E})$.

Theorem 1.3. *The hitting distribution $\nu = \nu_\vartheta$ of the λ-NRW on $(X,\mathfrak{E})$ is the normalized Hausdorff measure $\mathcal{H}^\alpha$ on K, and the Martin kernel satisfies the estimate*

$$K(\mathbf{x},\xi) \asymp \lambda^{|\mathbf{x}|-(\mathbf{x}|\xi)} r^{-\alpha(\mathbf{x}|\xi)}, \qquad \mathbf{x}\in X, \quad \xi\in K.$$

For the proof of the hitting distribution, the main part is to show that $F_n(\vartheta,\mathbf{x}) := \mathbb{P}_\vartheta(Z_{\tau_n} = \mathbf{x}) = r^{\alpha n}$ for $|\mathbf{x}| = n$, where τ_n is the first hitting time at level n (Theorem 4.6), then pass down to the limit (Theorem 5.7). Recall that the Martin kernel is given by

$$K(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) = \frac{G(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})}{G(\vartheta,\mathbf{y})} = \frac{F(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})}{F(\vartheta,\mathbf{y})}, \qquad \mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}\in X$$

where $G(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$ is the Green function, and $F(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$ is the probability of the chain ever visiting $\mathbf{y}$ from $\mathbf{x}$. The estimates of $F(\mathbf{x},\vartheta)$ (Proposition 4.1), $F(\vartheta,\mathbf{x})$ (Theorem 4.6), $F(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$ (Theorem 5.3) are the core of the proofs, which make use of the hyperbolicity of $(X,\mathfrak{E})$, and the harmonicity of the visiting probabilities on $(X,\mathfrak{E})$.

As in [Si], the Naim kernel is defined by

$$\Theta(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) = \frac{K(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})}{G(\mathbf{x},\vartheta)} = \frac{K(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})}{F(\mathbf{x},\theta)G(\vartheta,\vartheta)},$$

and is the discrete analogue of the kernel studied by [Na] in classical potential theory. It is simple to extend $\Theta(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$ to $\Theta(\mathbf{x},\eta)$ for $\eta\in K$. To extend to $\Theta(\xi,\eta)$ for $\xi\in K$, it is more involved, and there is an identity in [Si],

$$\Theta(\xi,\eta) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \sum\nolimits_{\mathbf{z}\in X} \ell_k^\xi(\mathbf{z})\Theta(\mathbf{z},\eta), \quad \xi,\eta\in K$$

where $\ell_k^\xi(\mathbf{z})$ is the probability for the ξ-process to last exit the kth-level at $\mathbf{z}$ (see (6.1), (6.3)). By evaluating the above limit, we have (Theorem 6.3)

Theorem 1.4. *For the λ-NRW on $(X, \mathfrak{E})$ with the energy form as in (1.3), the Naim kernel is given by*

$$\Theta(\xi, \eta) \asymp (\lambda r^\alpha)^{-(\xi|\eta)}, \quad \xi, \eta \in K.$$

Consequently by Theorem 1.1 and (1.4), the induced energy form is given by

$$\mathcal{E}_K[\varphi] \asymp \int_K \int_K |\varphi(\xi) - \varphi(\eta)|^2 \ |\xi - \eta|^{-(\alpha+\beta)} d\nu(\xi) d\nu(\eta)$$

with $\beta = \log \lambda / \log r$.

The domain $\mathcal{D}_K$ of $\mathcal{E}_K$ is the functions $\varphi \in L^2(K, \nu)$ such that $\mathcal{E}_K[\varphi] < \infty$ [Si]. It equals the Besov space $\Lambda_{2,2}^{\alpha,\beta/2}$ [St]. Let β^* be the critical exponent such that $\Lambda_{2,2}^{\alpha,\beta/2}$ is dense in $L^2(K, \nu)$ for all $0 < \beta < \beta^*$. Then the $\mathcal{E}_K$ with $0 < \beta < \beta^*$ is a non-local Dirichlet form. The values of β^* are known for some special cases, and there are certain β for which the Dirichlet forms are known to be regular ([St], [CK], [GHL1,2]). We will discuss this in Section 7, and more detail in a forthcoming paper.

In the text, the theorems are presented in greater generality. We will define a *pre-augmented tree* on an N-ary tree that has the hyperbolic property. Many results for the random walks will hold on such trees. For an IFS $\{S_i\}_{i=1}^N$ that is not homogeneous, we need to re-adjust the levels Σ^n as in (3.2), and the natural weights of the IFS as $p_i = r_i^\alpha$, where r_i is the contraction ratio of S_i, and α satisfies $\sum_{i=1}^N r_i^\alpha = 1$. Furthermore, we can consider a more general λ-quasi-natural random walk (λ-QNRW), which corresponds to weights $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^N$, that gives a doubling self-similar measure, and Theorems 1.2, 1.3 are still valid (the hitting distribution becomes the self-similar measure defined by the $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^N$).

For the organization of the paper, we first recall some basic facts on hyperbolic graphs and the potential theory of Markov chains in Section 2. In Section 3, we bring in the augmented tree $(X, \mathfrak{E})$ on the symbolic space, and study its hyperbolic structure. In Section 4, we introduce the classes of λ-QNRW and λ-NRW, and estimate the associated probabilities. Theorems 1.2 and Theorem 1.3 are proved in Section 5. In Section 6, after a brief review on some facts on the Naim kernel, we derive the expression as in Theorem 1.4. We give some discussion of the induced Dirichlet forms in Section 7.

2 Preliminaries

Let X be a countable set, an *(undirected simple) graph* is a pair $(X, \mathfrak{E})$ where $\mathfrak{E}$ is a symmetric subset of $X \times X \setminus \{(x, x) : x \in X\}$. We call $x \in X$ a vertex, and $(x, y) \in \mathfrak{E}$ an edge, which is also denoted by $x \sim y$. For $x \in X$, the *degree* of x, denoted by $\deg(x)$, is the number of edges connected to x. We say that $(X, \mathfrak{E})$ is of *bounded degree* if $\sup_{x \in X} \deg(x) < \infty$. For $x, y \in X$, a *path* from x to y with *length* n is a finite sequence $[x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ such that $x_0 = x, x_n = y$, and $(x_i, x_{i+1}) \in \mathfrak{E}$ for all $0 \leq i \leq n-1$. We always assume that $(X, \mathfrak{E})$ is *connected*, i.e., any two vertices can be connected by a path. A graph is called a *tree* if any two points can be connected by a *unique* non-self-intersecting path.

We use $\pi(x, y)$ to denote a path connecting two vertices x and y with minimum length, and call it a *geodesic path*. The length of $\pi(x, y)$ defines a metric $d(x, y)$ on $(X, \mathfrak{E})$. According to Gromov ([G], [Wo1,2]), for $x, y, z \in X$, the associated geodesic triangle is called δ-*thin* if the distance from any point on one side of the triangle to either of the other two sides is less than δ.

Definition 2.1. *We say that $(X, \mathfrak{E})$ is δ-hyperbolic if all geodesic triangles in X are δ-thin.*

Clearly, a tree is a hyperbolic graph with $\delta = 0$. Let ϑ be any fixed vertex in X as a *root*, we define the *Gromov product* as

$$(x|y)_\vartheta = \frac{1}{2}(|x| + |y| - d(x, y)), \qquad x, y \in X,$$

where $|x| = d(\vartheta, x)$. The following is a useful algebraic criterion for the geometric notion of hyperbolicity.

Proposition 2.2. *A graph $(X, \mathfrak{E})$ is δ-hyperbolic if and only if there exists δ' such that*

$$(x|y)_\vartheta \geq \min\{(x|z)_\vartheta, (z|y)_\vartheta\} - \delta', \qquad \forall\ x, y, z \in X. \tag{2.1}$$

The hyperbolicity of a graph does not depend on the root ϑ (although the δ' does), we will omit the subscript ϑ when there is no confusion. For a δ-hyperbolic graph $(X, \mathfrak{E})$ with a fixed reference vertex ϑ, we choose $a > 0$ such that $a' = e^{3\delta' a} - 1 < \sqrt{2}$. We define a *visual metric* on X as,

$$\varrho_a(x, y) = \begin{cases} e^{-a(x|y)}, & x \neq y, \\ 0\ , & x = y. \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

Note that ϱ_a satisfies $\varrho_a(x,y) \le (1+a')\max\{\varrho_a(x,y), \varrho_a(y,z)\}$ for all $x, y, z \in X$. It is not a metric, but it is equivalent to a metric. Hence we can regard ϱ_a as a metric as long as convergence is concerned. It is easy to see that a sequence $\{x_n\}_n \subseteq X$ such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} |x_n| = \infty$ is ϱ_a-Cauchy if and only if $\lim_{m,n\to\infty}(x_m|x_n) = \infty$.

Definition 2.3. *Let $\widehat{X}_H$ denote the completion of (X, ϱ_a). The hyperbolic boundary of $(X, \mathfrak{E})$ is defined as $\partial_H X = \widehat{X}_H \setminus X$.*

The hyperbolic boundary $\partial_H X$ is a compact set. It can be regarded as the collection of all geodesic rays starting at ϑ, where two rays $\{x_n\}$ and $\{y_n\}$ are identified if $\lim_{n\to\infty}(x_n|y_n) = \infty$.

Next we set up some notations of a Markov chain. For a countably infinite set X (or an infinite graph $(X, \mathfrak{E})$), let $\{Z_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ be a Markov chain on X with transition probability P. We shall write the conditional probability $\mathbb{P}(\cdot \mid Z_0 = x)$ by $\mathbb{P}_x(\cdot)$ for short. A function u on X is said to be *harmonic* (with respect to P) if $Pu = u$ where $Pu(x) = \sum_{y\in X} P(x,y)u(y) = \mathbb{E}_x u(Z_1)$. The *spectral radius* of an irreducible Markov chain is defined as

$$r(P) = \limsup_{n\to\infty}(P^n(x,y))^{1/n} \in (0,1], \quad x, y \in X.$$

(Note that the limsup does not depend on x and y [Wo1].) If $r(P) < 1$, then P is transient, but the converse is not true. The *Green function* with respect to P is $G(x,y) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} P^k(x,y)$. In our discussion, we always assume that the Markov chain is irreducible and transient. Hence $0 < G(x,y) < \infty$ for any x, $y \in X$. We define $F(x,y)$ as the probability that the chain starting from x ever visits y, i.e.,

$$F(x,y) := \mathbb{P}_x(\exists\ n \ge 0\ \ni\ Z_n = y). \tag{2.3}$$

This probability plays a special role in our consideration. For $x \ne y$, $F(x,y)$ satisfies the one-step formula, which will be used repeatedly:

$$F(x,y) = P(x,y) + \sum_{u\ne y} P(x,u)F(u,y). \tag{2.4}$$

It follows that for any fixed $y \in X$, $F(\cdot, y)$ is harmonic on $X \setminus \{y\}$. Also it is easy to show that $G(x,y) = F(x,y)G(y,y)$.

Fix a reference point ϑ on X. We define the *Martin kernel* by

$$K(x,y) := \frac{G(x,y)}{G(\vartheta,y)} = \frac{F(x,y)}{F(\vartheta,y)}, \quad x, y \in X.$$

The following definition is from [Wo1].

Definition 2.4. *The Martin compactification of (X, P) is the minimal compactification $\widehat{X}$ of X such that for each $x \in X$, the Martin kernel $K(x, \cdot)$ extends continuously to $\widehat{X}$. The set $\mathcal{M} = \widehat{X} \setminus X$ is called the Martin boundary of (X, P).*

It is known that under the Martin topology, $\{Z_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ converges almost surely to a random variable Z_∞ with value in the Martin boundary $\mathcal{M}$. For the chain starting at $x \in X$, we define the hitting distribution ν_x to be the distribution of Z_∞:

$$\nu_x(B) = \mathbb{P}_x(Z_\infty \in B), \quad B \subseteq \mathcal{M} \text{ a Borel set.}$$

The measure ν_x is absolutely continuous with respect to ν_ϑ, and the Radon-Nikodym density is $d\nu_x/d\nu_\vartheta = K(x, \cdot)$. For $u \in L^1(\mathcal{M}; \nu_\vartheta)$, we define its *Poisson integral* by

$$Hu(x) = \mathbb{E}_x u(Z_\infty) = \int_{\mathcal{M}} K(x, \xi) u(\xi) d\nu_\vartheta(\xi), \quad x \in X.$$

Clearly Hu is harmonic on X. A nonnegative harmonic function h on X is called *minimal* if $h(\vartheta) = 1$ and if $h = h_1 + h_2$ such that both h_1 and h_2 are nonnegative harmonic functions on X, then h/h_1 is constant. Clearly $K(\cdot, \xi)$ is harmonic for any $\xi \in \mathcal{M}$. We define the *minimal Martin boundary* as $\mathcal{M}_{\min} = \{\xi \in \mathcal{M} : K(\cdot, \xi) \text{ is minimal}\}$. Then Z_∞ is actually an $\mathcal{M}_{\min}$-valued random variable, and ν_ϑ is supported by $\mathcal{M}_{\min}$.

We say that P has *bounded range* if $\sup\{d(x, y) : P(x, y) > 0 \text{ for some } x, y \in X\} < \infty$, and is *uniformly irreducible* if there exist $\epsilon > 0$ and k_0 such that for any $x \sim y$, there exist $k \le k_0$ with $P^k(x, y) \ge \epsilon$. The following theorem provides a useful tool to study random walks on hyperbolic graphs. It is due to Ancona [An1,2] in a more general setting, although we use the graph version from [Wo1, Theorem 27.1].

Theorem 2.5. (Ancona) *Suppose that X is a hyperbolic graph, and P is uniformly irreducible with bounded range, and $r(P) < 1$. Then for $\delta \ge 0$, there is a constant $C_\delta \ge 1$ such that for any x, $y \in X$ and u within distance δ from a geodesic segment between x and y,*

$$F(x, u)F(u, y) \le F(x, y) \le C_\delta F(x, u)F(u, y). \tag{2.5}$$

Moreover, the Martin boundary equals the minimal boundary, and is homeomorphic to the hyperbolic boundary.

Our main interest is on the class of (transient) *reversible random walks* on $(X, \mathfrak{E})$, where the transition function P satisfies

$$P(x, y) = \frac{c(x, y)}{m(x)}, \quad x \sim y, \tag{2.6}$$

and is 0 elsewhere. Here $c(x,y) = c(y,x) > 0$ for each pair $(x,y) \in \mathfrak{E}$. We call $c(x,y)$ the *conductance* of the edge (x,y), and $m(x) = \sum_{y \in X, y \sim x} c(x,y) > 0$ the *total conductance* at x. To apply Theorems 2.5, we need to take care of the condition $r(P) < 1$. Here we cite a geometric characterization of this condition in [Wo1, Theorem 10.3] which will be used in Section 5. For $A \subseteq X$, let

$$\partial A = \{(x,y) \in \mathfrak{E} : x \in A,\ y \notin A\}$$

be the *boundary* of A and let $c(\partial A) = \sum_{(x,y)\in\partial A} c(x,y)$ (analogous to the surface area of A). We also view $m(A) = \sum_{x \in A} m(x)$ as the "volume" of A.

Proposition 2.6. *Suppose P is a reversible random walk on $(X, \mathfrak{E})$. Then $r(P) < 1$ if and only if (X, P) satisfies the strong isoperimetric inequality: there exists $\eta > 0$ such that*

$$m(A) \leq \eta c(\partial A)$$

for all finite subsets $A \subseteq X$.

3 Self-similar sets and augmented trees

Let $\{S_i\}_{i=1}^N$, $N \geq 2$, be an *iterated function system (IFS)* of contractive similitudes on $\mathbb{R}^d$ with contraction ratios $r_i \in (0,1)$. The *self-similar set* K of the IFS is the unique non-empty compact set in $\mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying

$$K = \bigcup_{i=1}^N S_i(K).$$

For a set of positive probability weights $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^N$, we define a self-similar measure by

$$\mu(\cdot) = \sum_{i=1}^N p_i \mu(S_i^{-1}(\cdot)). \tag{3.1}$$

The IFS is said to satisfy the *open set condition* (OSC) if there exists a nonempty bounded open set U such that $S_i(U) \subset U$, and $S_i(U) \cap S_j(U) = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$. The OSC is the most basic condition imposed on the IFS. It is known that under such condition, the Hausdorff dimension of K, denoted by $\dim_H(K)$, is α where $\sum_{i=1}^N r_i^\alpha = 1$. Furthermore, if we take $p_i = r_i^\alpha, i = 1, \cdots, N$, then the self-similar measure is the normalized α-Hausdorff measure on K. We call such weight $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^N$ the *natural weight* of the IFS.

The IFS gives rise to a symbolic space. We let Σ^* and Σ^∞ be the sets of finite indices (words) and infinite indices respectively as in Section 1. For $\mathbf{x} = i_1 \cdots i_n \in$

Σ^*, we let $S_{\mathbf{x}}$ be the composition $S_{\mathbf{x}} = S_{i_1} \circ \cdots \circ S_{i_n}$, and the contraction ratio of $S_{\mathbf{x}}$ is denoted by $r_{\mathbf{x}} = r_{i_1} \cdots r_{i_n}$. There exists a natural surjection $\kappa : \Sigma^\infty \to K$ defined by

$$\{\kappa(\omega)\} = \bigcap\nolimits_{m\geq 0} S_{i_1 i_2 \cdots i_m}(K), \qquad \omega = i_1 i_2 \cdots \in \Sigma^\infty.$$

Hence each $\xi \in K$ admits a symbolic representation (coding) $\omega \in \Sigma^\infty$. Under the open set condition (OSC), the representation is unique up to a μ-zero set for any self-similar measure μ.

The finite word space Σ^* has a natural graph structure with $\mathbf{x} \sim \mathbf{y}$ if $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{x}i$ or $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y}i$ for some $i \in \Sigma$. It is a tree with ϑ as the root. The canonical metric on Σ^* is $\rho_r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = r^{\mathbf{x}\wedge\mathbf{y}}$ $(0 < r < 1)$, where $\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{y} = \min\{k : i_{k+1} \neq j_{k+1}\}$. Note that $\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{y}$ coincides with the Gromov product, and ρ_r is a visual metric as in (2.2); the (hyperbolic) boundary is Σ^∞, and is a Cantor-type set. The symbolic space is a convenient tool to study the self-similar set K, but obviously it misses many properties of K. In the following we will define an "augmented tree" by adding more edges to Σ^*, so that it will inherit better the structure from the IFS and the self-similar set.

First, to deal with an IFS with different contraction ratios, we have a standard technique to modify the symbolic space by grouping together words that have approximately equal contraction ratios. Let $r = \min\{r_i : 1 \leq i \leq N\}$. Define for $n \geq 1$,

$$\mathcal{J}_n = \{\mathbf{x} = i_1 \cdots i_k \in \Sigma^* : r_{\mathbf{x}} \leq r^n < r_{i_1 \cdots i_{k-1}}\}, \tag{3.2}$$

and $\mathcal{J}_0 = \{\vartheta\}$ by convention. Clearly, $\mathcal{J}_n \cap \mathcal{J}_m = \emptyset$ for $n \neq m$. We define the *modified symbolic space* as $X = \bigcup_{k=0}^\infty \mathcal{J}_k$. We write $|\mathbf{x}| = n$ if $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{J}_n$, and use $\mathbf{x}^-$ to denote the *parent* of $\mathbf{x} \in X$, i.e., the unique word in X such that $|\mathbf{x}^-| = |\mathbf{x}| - 1$. We also define $\mathbf{x}^{-k}, k \geq 2$ for the unique word in X such that $|\mathbf{x}^{-k}| = |\mathbf{x}| - k$ and $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}^{-k}\mathbf{z}$ for some $\mathbf{z} \in \Sigma^*$. In particular, if the IFS $\{S_i\}_{i=1}^N$ has equal contraction ratio (*homogeneous* IFS), then $\mathcal{J}_n = \Sigma^n$ and $\mathbf{x}^{-k}$ is just $\mathbf{x}$ with the last k alphabets deleted. The following lemma is known.

Lemma 3.1. *Under the OSC, let α be the Hausdorff dimension of K. Then*

(i) if μ is the self-similar measure with natural weights $p_i = r_i^\alpha$, then for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{J}_n$, $p_{\mathbf{x}} = S_{\mathbf{x}}(K) \asymp r^{\alpha n}$;

(ii) $r^{-\alpha n} \leq \#\mathcal{J}_n < r^{-\alpha(n+1)}$.

Proof. Note that $p_{\mathbf{x}} = r_{\mathbf{x}}^\alpha$, and by definition $r_{\mathbf{x}} \in (r^{n+1}, r^n]$ for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{J}_n$. Also the OSC implies that $p_{\mathbf{x}} = \mu(S_{\mathbf{x}}(K))$, and hence (i) follows. Observe that

$$1 = \mu(K) = \sum\nolimits_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{J}_n} \mu(S_{\mathbf{x}}(K)) = \sum\nolimits_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{J}_n} r_{\mathbf{x}}^\alpha.$$

As $r_{\mathbf{x}} \in (r^{n+1}, r^n]$, we have $(\#\mathcal{J}_n) r^{\alpha(n+1)} < 1 \leq (\#\mathcal{J}_n) r^{\alpha n}$. This implies (ii). □

To introduce a graph structure on X, we let

$$\mathfrak{E}_v = \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in X \times X : \ \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y}^- \text{ or } \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{x}^-\},$$

be the set of edges of the original tree structure on X, and use the notation $\mathbf{x} \sim_v \mathbf{y}$ for $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathfrak{E}_v$. We call $\mathfrak{E}_v$ the set of *vertical edges* of X. Following Kaimanovich [Ka], we can augment the tree by adding more *horizontal edges* in the following sense.

Definition 3.2. *Let X be the modified symbolic space associated with $\{S_i\}_{i=1}^N$. We call $(X, \mathfrak{E})$ a pre-augmented tree if $\mathfrak{E} = \mathfrak{E}_v \cup \mathfrak{E}_h$, with $\mathfrak{E}_h$ satisfying*

$$(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathfrak{E}_h \Rightarrow |\mathbf{x}| = |\mathbf{y}|, \ \textit{with } \mathbf{x}^- = \mathbf{y}^- \textit{ or } (\mathbf{x}^-, \mathbf{y}^-) \in \mathfrak{E}_h. \tag{3.3}$$

We use $\mathbf{x} \sim_h \mathbf{y}$ to denote $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathfrak{E}_h$.

For any vertices $\mathbf{x}$, $\mathbf{y}$ in $(X, \mathfrak{E})$, we say that the geodesic $\pi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is a *horizontal geodesic* if it consists of horizontal edges only, and define *vertical geodesics* similarly. The geodesic of two vertices $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}$ may not be unique (see Figure 1), but there is always a *canonical geodesic* such that there exist $\mathbf{u}$, $\mathbf{v} \in \pi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ with

(i) $\pi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \pi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) \cup \pi(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \cup \pi(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{y})$, where $\pi(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ is a horizontal geodesic and $\pi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$, $\pi(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{y})$ are vertical geodesics.

(ii) for any geodesic $\pi'(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$, $\text{dist}(\vartheta, \pi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})) \leq \text{dist}(\vartheta, \pi'(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}))$.



Figure 1: Canonical geodesic

If we let $\ell = \text{dist}(\vartheta, \pi(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}))$, and $h = d(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$, then the canonical geodesic has a simple geometric interpretation for the Gromov product [LW1],

$$(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{y}) = \ell - \frac{1}{2}h. \tag{3.4}$$

The following proposition is proved in [LW1].

Proposition 3.3. *A pre-augmented tree $(X, \mathfrak{E})$ is hyperbolic if and only if there exists $M > 0$ such that the lengths of all horizontal geodesics are bounded by M.*

The concept of pre-augmented tree is rather flexible (see Example 3.7) . For our purpose, we will use the following specific horizontal edge set in connection with the structure of the self-similar set.

Definition 3.4. [LW3] *For $\gamma > 0$, we define a horizontal edge set $\mathfrak{E}_h^\gamma$ on X by*

$$\mathfrak{E}_h^\gamma = \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in X \times X : \ \mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{y}, \ |\mathbf{x}| = |\mathbf{y}| \ \textit{and} \ \inf_{\xi,\eta \in K} |S_{\mathbf{x}}(\xi) - S_{\mathbf{y}}(\eta)| \leq \gamma \cdot r^{|\mathbf{x}|}\}. \quad (3.5)$$

The augmented tree $(X, \mathfrak{E}^\gamma)$ is the graph with edge set $\mathfrak{E}^\gamma = \mathfrak{E}_v \cup \mathfrak{E}_h^\gamma$.

It is direct to check that $(X, \mathfrak{E}^\gamma)$ is a pre-augmented tree. As a particular $\gamma > 0$ has no real significance on the edges in the levels $\mathcal{J}_n$ when n is large, we will omit the superscript γ in the notations when there is no confusion. The following theorem is the main purpose to introduce the augmented tree. It allows us to identify the self-similar set with the hyperbolic boundary of $(X, \mathfrak{E})$.

Theorem 3.5. [LW3] *Let $\{S_i\}_{i=1}^N$ be an IFS of contractive similitudes and K the self-similar set. Let $(X, \mathfrak{E})$ be the augmented tree. Then*

(i) $(X, \mathfrak{E})$ is hyperbolic;

(ii) there is a canonical identification $\iota : \partial_H X \to K$ (independent of $\gamma > 0$) defined by $\{\iota(\xi)\} = \bigcap_n S_{\mathbf{x}_n}(K)$ and $(\mathbf{x}_n)_n$ is a geodesic ray converging to ξ. Under this map, K is Hölder equivalent to $\partial_H X$ in the sense that $\varrho_a(\xi, \eta) \asymp |\iota(\xi) - \iota(\eta)|^{-a/\log r}$.

We remark that the above theorem was first proved in [LW1] where the horizontal edge set is

$$\mathfrak{E}_h^0 = \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in X \times X : \ \mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{y}, \ |\mathbf{x}| = |\mathbf{y}| \text{ and } S_{\mathbf{x}}(K) \cap S_{\mathbf{y}}(K) \neq \emptyset\},$$

where we need to assume, in addition, the OSC and some geometric condition on K. For many standard self-similar sets, $\mathfrak{E}_h^\gamma = \mathfrak{E}_h^0$ for γ small, but there are examples that they are different for any $\gamma > 0$. The set up in Definition 3.4 with $\gamma > 0$ allows us to avoid the delicate behavior on $S_{\mathbf{x}}(K) \cap S_{\mathbf{y}}(K)$, and, on the other hand there is no change on the boundary; consequently, we can eliminate the technical assumptions in [LW1] and obtain Theorem 3.5 in the most general setting.

Example 3.6. Let $e_0 = 0$ and $e_i, i = 1, ..., d$ be the standard basis vectors in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Let $\{S_i\}_{i=0}^d$ be an IFS on $\mathbb{R}^d$ defined by

$$S_i(\xi) = e_i + \frac{1}{2}(\xi - e_i), \quad \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Then the self-similar set K is the d-dimensional Sierpinski gasket. When $d = 1$, K is simply the unit interval, and when $d = 2$, K is the standard Sierpinski gasket. Figure 2 is the corresponding augmented trees when $\gamma < 1$ for $d = 1$, and $\gamma < \sqrt{2}/2$ for $d = 2$. The hyperbolic boundary is Hölder equivalent to K.



Figure 2: The Sierpinski graphs

We remark that a pre-augmented tree can be constructed easily, and can be trivial; for example, we can connect all the vertices in each level by edges and still form a hyperbolic graph. On the other hand, if we augment the tree by suitable edges, we can obtain other interesting graphs.

Example 3.7. For the binary augmented tree in the above example ($d = 1$), we can add in one more horizontal edge on each level to connect the two end vertices. $(X, \mathfrak{E})$ is a pre-augmented tree and is hyperbolic (see Figure 3). It is easy to modify the proof of Theorem 3.5 slightly and show that the hyperbolic boundary is Hölder equivalent to the unit circle (cf [Ne]).

That an augmented tree has bounded degree is important when we consider random walks on it. This property is verified when the IFS has the OSC [LW3].

Proposition 3.8. *The IFS $\{S_i\}_{i=1}^N$ satisfies the OSC if and only if the augmented tree $(X, \mathfrak{E})$ has bounded degree. In this case, there exists $k', k'' > 0$ such that for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{J}_n (\subseteq X)$,*

$$N \le \#\{\mathbf{z} \in \Sigma^* : \mathbf{xz} \in \mathcal{J}_{n+1}\} \le k', \quad \#\{\mathbf{y} \in X : \mathbf{y} \sim_h \mathbf{x}\} \le k'',$$

and it follows that $N \le \deg(\mathbf{x}) \le k' + k'' + 1$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in X$.



Figure 3: The circle as a hyperbolic boundary

To conclude this section, we will use the special form of the canonical geodesic (see Figure 1) to provide more information of the Gromov product in the augmented tree, which will be needed in Section 6. Note that for any geodesic ray $(\mathbf{x}_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$ in X (starting from ϑ), we have $\mathbf{x}_n \in \mathcal{J}_n$.

Lemma 3.9. *Let $(X, \mathfrak{E})$ be a pre-augmented tree as in Definition 3.2. Let $\mathbf{z} \in X$, and let $(\mathbf{x}_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$ and $(\mathbf{y}_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$ be two distinct geodesic rays from ϑ. Then we have*

(i) for $n \geq |\mathbf{z}| := k$, $d(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{z}) - |\mathbf{x}_n| = d(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{z}) - k$;

(ii) $\{(\mathbf{x}_n|\mathbf{z})\}_n$ is increasing, and $(\mathbf{x}_n|\mathbf{z}) = (\mathbf{x}_k|\mathbf{z})$ for $n \geq k$;

(iii) $\{(\mathbf{x}_n|\mathbf{y}_n)\}_n$ is increasing, and there exists n_1 such that $(\mathbf{x}_n|\mathbf{y}_n) = (\mathbf{x}_{n_1}|\mathbf{y}_{n_1})$ for $n \geq n_1$.

Proof. (i) For $n \geq |\mathbf{z}| := k$, consider the canonical geodesic between $\mathbf{x}_n$ and $\mathbf{z}$:

$$\pi(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{z}) = \pi(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{u}) \cup \pi(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \cup \pi(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{z}),$$

where $\pi(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ is a horizontal geodesic, and $\pi(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{u})$, $\pi(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{z})$ are vertical geodesics. Since $|\mathbf{x}_n| = n \geq |k| \geq |\mathbf{u}| = |\mathbf{v}|$, $\mathbf{x}_k$ lies on the vertical geodesic $\pi(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{u})$. Hence (i) follows from

$$\begin{aligned} d(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{z}) - |\mathbf{x}_n| &= d(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{u}) + d(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{z}) - |\mathbf{x}_n| = d(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{z}) - |\mathbf{u}| \\ &= d(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{z}) + d(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{u}) - |\mathbf{x}_k| = d(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{z}) - k \end{aligned}$$

(ii) That

$$(\mathbf{x}_{n+1}|\mathbf{z}) = \frac{1}{2}(n + 1 + |\mathbf{z}| - d(\mathbf{x}_{n+1}, \mathbf{z})) \geq \frac{1}{2}(n + |\mathbf{z}| - d(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{z})) = (\mathbf{x}_n|\mathbf{z})$$

implies $(\mathbf{x}_n|\mathbf{z})$ is increasing on n. Also, by (i), we have

$$(\mathbf{x}_n|\mathbf{z}) = \frac{1}{2}(|\mathbf{z}| + |\mathbf{x}_n| - d(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{z})) = \frac{1}{2}(2k - d(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{z})) = (\mathbf{x}_k|\mathbf{z}), \quad n \geq k,$$

(iii) By the same proof as above, we obtain $(\mathbf{x}_{n+1}|\mathbf{y}_{n+1}) \geq (\mathbf{x}_n|\mathbf{y}_n)$. Let M be the maximal length of the horizontal geodesics in $(X, \mathfrak{E})$ (by Theorem 3.3). Since the two rays are distinct, we have $\lim_{n\to\infty}(\mathbf{x}_n|\mathbf{y}_n) < \infty$. As $(\mathbf{x}_n|\mathbf{y}_n) = n - d(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{y}_n)/2$, we must have $d(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{y}_n) \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$. Hence there exists a positive integer n_1 such that for any $n \geq n_1$, $d(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{y}_n) > M$.

For $n \geq n_1$, consider the canonical geodesic $\pi(\mathbf{x}_{n+1}, \mathbf{y}_{n+1})$. Since $d(\mathbf{x}_{n+1}, \mathbf{y}_{n+1}) > M$, $\pi(\mathbf{x}_{n+1}, \mathbf{y}_{n+1})$ is not horizontal. This means both $\mathbf{x}_n$ and $\mathbf{y}_n$ lie in the two vertical segments of $\pi(\mathbf{x}_{n+1}, \mathbf{y}_{n+1})$ respectively. Hence

$$(\mathbf{x}_{n+1}|\mathbf{y}_{n+1}) = 2n + 2 - d(\mathbf{x}_{n+1}, \mathbf{y}_{n+1}) = 2n - d(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{y}_n) = (\mathbf{x}_n|\mathbf{y}_n).$$

□

Corollary 3.10. *Let $(X, \mathfrak{E})$ be an augmented tree as in Definition 3.4. Let $\xi, \eta \in \partial_H X$, $\xi \neq \eta$, and let $(\mathbf{x}_n), (\mathbf{x}'_n), (\mathbf{y}_n), (\mathbf{y}'_n)$ be geodesic rays, with $(\mathbf{x}_n), (\mathbf{x}'_n)$ converging to ξ, and $(\mathbf{y}_n), (\mathbf{y}'_n)$ converging to η. Then for any $\mathbf{z} \in X$,*

$$\big|\lim_{n\to\infty}(\mathbf{x}_n|\mathbf{z}) - \lim_{n\to\infty}(\mathbf{x}'_n|\mathbf{z})\big| \leq \frac{1}{2}, \quad \textit{and} \quad \big|\lim_{n\to\infty}(\mathbf{x}_n|\mathbf{y}_n) - \lim_{n\to\infty}(\mathbf{x}'_n|\mathbf{y}'_n)\big| \leq 1.$$

Proof. We first observe from Theorem 3.5 that $\xi \in S_{\mathbf{x}_n}(K) \cap S_{\mathbf{x}'_n}(K)$. Thus $S_{\mathbf{x}_n}(K) \cap S_{\mathbf{x}'_n}(K) \neq \emptyset$, and by (3.5) either $\mathbf{x}_n = \mathbf{x}'_n$ or $\mathbf{x}_n \sim_h \mathbf{x}'_n$. It follows that $d(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{x}'_n) \leq 1$ for all n. Then the triangle inequality implies

$$|(\mathbf{x}_n|\mathbf{z}) - (\mathbf{x}'_n|\mathbf{z})| = \frac{1}{2}|d(\mathbf{x}'_n, \mathbf{z}) - d(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{z})| \leq \frac{1}{2}d(\mathbf{x}'_n, \mathbf{x}_n) \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

For the second part,

$$|(\mathbf{x}_n|\mathbf{y}_n) - (\mathbf{x}'_n|\mathbf{y}'_n)| = \frac{1}{2}|d(\mathbf{x}'_n, \mathbf{y}'_n) - d(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{y}_n)| \leq \frac{1}{2}(d(\mathbf{x}'_n, \mathbf{x}_n) + d(\mathbf{y}'_n, \mathbf{y}_n)) \leq 1.$$

The assertion follows by taking limits.

□

It follows from the corollary that we can extend the Gromov product to $\partial_H X$ as

$$(\xi|\mathbf{z}) = \sup\big\{\lim_{n\to\infty}(\mathbf{x}_n|\mathbf{z})\big\}, \qquad \xi \in \partial_H X, \quad \mathbf{z} \in X, \tag{3.6}$$

and

$$(\xi|\eta) = \sup\big\{\lim_{n\to\infty}(\mathbf{x}_n|\mathbf{y}_n)\big\}, \qquad \xi, \eta \in \partial_H X. \tag{3.7}$$

where the supremum is taken over all geodesic rays $(\mathbf{x}_n)_n$ and $(\mathbf{y}_n)_n$ that converge to ξ and η respectively.

4 Constant return ratio and quasi-natural RW

In this section, we consider certain reversible random walks on pre-augmented trees, and obtain the values and estimates of the probabilities $F(\mathbf{x}, \vartheta)$ and $F(\vartheta, \mathbf{x})$.

Let $\{Z_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ be a reversible random walk (see (2.6)) on the pre-augmented tree $(X, \mathfrak{E})$. For $\mathbf{x} \in X \setminus \{\vartheta\}$, we define the *return ratio* at $\mathbf{x}$ by

$$\lambda(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{P(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^-)}{\sum\limits_{\mathbf{y}:\mathbf{y}^-=\mathbf{x}} P(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})} = \frac{c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^-)}{\sum\limits_{\mathbf{y}:\mathbf{y}^-=\mathbf{x}} c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}. \tag{4.1}$$

For fixed $\lambda > 0$, we introduce the following condition on the transition probability P:

(R_λ) (*Constant return ratio*) For any $\mathbf{x} \in X \setminus \{\vartheta\}$, $\lambda(\mathbf{x}) \equiv \lambda$ is a constant.

For example, the SRW on the augmented tree of a homogeneous IFS $\{S_i\}_{i=1}^N$ satisfies condition (R_λ) with $\lambda = N^{-1}$.

For $m \geq 1$, let $X_m := \bigcup_{k=0}^m \mathcal{J}_k$ and $\mathfrak{E}_m := \mathfrak{E}|_{X_m \times X_m}$. Consider the following random walk $\{Z_n^{(m)}\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ with transition probability P_m on the graph $(X_m, \mathfrak{E}_m)$: for $\mathbf{x}$, $\mathbf{y} \in X_m$,

$$P_m(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \begin{cases} P(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \sim \mathbf{y} \text{ and } |\mathbf{x}| < m, \\ 1, & \text{if } \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y} \text{ and } |\mathbf{x}| = m, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This is the restriction of P on $X_m \setminus \mathcal{J}_m$, together with the vertices in $\mathcal{J}_m$ as absorbing states of P_m. Let $F_m(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ be the probability of ever visiting $\mathbf{y}$ from $\mathbf{x}$ in X_m, i.e.,

$$F_m(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := \mathbb{P}(\exists\ n \geq 0\ \ni\ Z_n^{(m)} = \mathbf{y} \mid Z_0^{(m)} = \mathbf{x}).$$

We begin by finding the value of $F_m(\mathbf{x}, \vartheta)$ for a reversible random walk with condition (R_λ); it is the cornerstone in the rest of the estimates.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $\{Z_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ be a reversible random walk on a pre-augmented tree $(X, \mathfrak{E})$, and satisfies (R_λ) for some $\lambda > 0$. Then for $m \geq 1$ and $\mathbf{x} \in X_m$,*

$$F_m(\mathbf{x}, \vartheta) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{\lambda^{|\mathbf{x}|} - \lambda^m}{1 - \lambda^m}, & \text{if } \lambda \neq 1, \\ \dfrac{m - |\mathbf{x}|}{m}, & \text{if } \lambda = 1. \end{cases} \tag{4.2}$$

Consequently, $F(\mathbf{x}, \vartheta) = \lambda^{|\mathbf{x}|}$ if $0 \leq \lambda < 1$, and $= 1$ if $\lambda \geq 1$.

Proof. Fix $m \geq 1$. If $\mathbf{x} = \vartheta$, then clearly, $F_m(\vartheta, \vartheta) = 1$; as $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{J}_m$ is an absorbing state, hence $F_m(\mathbf{x}, \vartheta) = 0$ is also trivial. Let $\varphi(\mathbf{x})$ denote the function on the right side of (4.2). Note that $\varphi(\mathbf{x}) = \varphi(\mathbf{y})$ for $\mathbf{x}$, $\mathbf{y}$ in each level $\mathcal{J}_k$, $k \leq m$. We claim that $\varphi(\mathbf{x})$ is harmonic on $X_m \setminus (\{\vartheta\} \cup \mathcal{J}_m)$ with respect to (X_m, P_m). Indeed, for $\lambda \neq 1$ and $\mathbf{x} \in X_m \setminus (\{\vartheta\} \cup \mathcal{J}_m)$, we can write $\varphi(\mathbf{x})$ as

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi(\mathbf{x}) &= \frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda}\Big(\frac{\lambda^{|\mathbf{x}|-1} - \lambda^m}{1-\lambda^m} + \frac{1}{\lambda} \cdot \frac{\lambda^{|\mathbf{x}|+1} - \lambda^m}{1-\lambda^m}\Big) \\ &= \frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda}\Big(\varphi(\mathbf{x}^-) + \frac{1}{P(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^-)} \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in X : \mathbf{y}^- = \mathbf{x}} P(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\varphi(\mathbf{y})\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

Clearly the above identity also holds for $\lambda = 1$. To check that $\varphi(\mathbf{x})$ is harmonic, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{\mathbf{y} \sim \mathbf{x}} P(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\varphi(\mathbf{y}) \\ &= P(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^-)\varphi(\mathbf{x}^-) + \Big(\sum_{\mathbf{y} \in X : \mathbf{y}^- = \mathbf{x}} + \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in X : \mathbf{y} \sim_h \mathbf{x}}\Big) P(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\varphi(\mathbf{y}) \\ &= (1 + \lambda^{-1}) P(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^-)\varphi(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in X : \mathbf{y} \sim_h \mathbf{x}} P(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\varphi(\mathbf{y}) \qquad \text{(by (4.3))} \\ &= \varphi(\mathbf{x})\Big(P(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^-) + \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in X : \mathbf{y}^- = \mathbf{x}} P(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) + \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in X : \mathbf{y} \sim_h \mathbf{x}} P(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\Big) \quad \text{(by } (R_\lambda)) \\ &= \varphi(\mathbf{x}),\end{aligned}$$

and the claim follows.

Now by regarding X_m as a finite domain with boundary $\mathcal{J}_0 \cup \mathcal{J}_m$, then both $F_m(\cdot, \vartheta)$ and φ are harmonic on the interior $X_m \setminus (\mathcal{J}_0 \cup \mathcal{J}_m)$, and have the same boundary condition: $F_m(\vartheta, \vartheta) = \varphi(\vartheta) = 1$ and $F_m(\mathbf{x}, \vartheta) = \varphi(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{J}_m$. By the maximum principle of harmonic functions, such harmonic function is unique. Hence $F_m(\cdot, \vartheta) = \varphi$, and (4.2) follows.

Since for $|\mathbf{x}| < m$, $F_m(\mathbf{x}, \vartheta) \nearrow F(\mathbf{x}, \vartheta)$ as $m \to \infty$, the second part follows by taking limit of (4.2). □

As a simple example to illustrate Theorem 4.1, we consider the SRW on the binary augmented tree for the unit interval (as in Example 3.6, d=1). The values of $F_m(\mathbf{x}, \theta)$ are calculated for two steps. It is interesting to see that on each level, the probability $F_m(\mathbf{x}, \vartheta)$ has the same value even though $\deg(\mathbf{x})$ are different.

Remark. We thank Kigami for informing us that there is another intuitive way to obtain the $F_m(\mathbf{x}, \vartheta)$. For $n \geq 0$, let $t(n) = \inf\{k \geq n : |Z_k| \neq |Z_n|\}$ be the



Figure 4: $F_m(\mathbf{x}, \theta), m = 3$, for SRW on the binary augmented tree

first time that the random walk jumps to a different level from time n. Define a sequence of discrete time $\{n_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ by letting $n_0 = 0$ and $n_k = t(n_{k-1})$ for $k \geq 1$. For $k \geq 0$, let $L_k = |Z_{n_k}|$ denote the level of the chain. It can be checked directly that $\{L_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ is a birth and death chain on the nonnegative integers with transition probabilities: $P(0,1) = 1$, $P(\ell, \ell-1) = \lambda/(1+\lambda)$, and $P(\ell, \ell+1) = 1/(1+\lambda)$ for $\ell \geq 1$. Let T_ℓ be the first time that L_k visits level ℓ, then the expression of $F_m(\mathbf{x}, \vartheta) = \mathbb{P}(T_0 < T_m \mid L_0 = |\mathbf{x}|)$ for $\mathbf{x} \in X_m$ follows from the birth and death chain.

Since our main interest is on the transient random walk, we will restrict $\lambda \in (0,1)$ throughout the paper. As a simple consequence of Theorem 4.1, we have the follow result on the Green function, which will be needed to consider $F_m(\vartheta, \mathbf{x})$ and $F(\vartheta, \mathbf{x})$.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\{Z_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ be a reversible random walk on a pre-augmented tree $(X, \mathfrak{E})$, and $G_m(\cdot,\cdot)$ be the Green function of $\{Z_n^{(m)}\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$. If $\{Z_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ satisfies condition (R_λ) with $\lambda \in (0,1)$, then*

$$G_m(\vartheta, \vartheta) = \frac{1-\lambda^m}{1-\lambda} \ , \tag{4.4}$$

and $G(\vartheta, \vartheta) = \frac{1}{1-\lambda}$.

Proof. We make use of the basic identity for Green functions:

$$G_m(\vartheta, \vartheta) = \frac{1}{1 - U_m(\vartheta, \vartheta)} \ ,$$

where $U_m(\vartheta, \vartheta) := \mathbb{P}(\exists\ n \geq 1\ \ni Z_n^{(m)} = \vartheta \mid Z_0^{(m)} = \vartheta)$ is the probability that the random walk returns to ϑ after starting at the root ϑ. By the one-step formula (2.4)

and Proposition 4.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} U_m(\vartheta,\vartheta) &= \sum_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{J}_1} P_m(\vartheta,\mathbf{x})F_m(\mathbf{x},\vartheta) \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{J}_1} P_m(\vartheta,\mathbf{x})\cdot\frac{\lambda-\lambda^m}{1-\lambda^m} \\ &= \frac{\lambda-\lambda^m}{1-\lambda^m}\ . \end{aligned}$$

Hence (4.4) follows from the basic identity. The expression $G(\vartheta,\vartheta)=\dfrac{1}{1-U(\vartheta,\vartheta)}=\dfrac{1}{1-\lambda}$ follows by taking limit as $m\to\infty$. □

Proposition 4.3. *Let $\{Z_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ be a reversible random walk on a pre-augmented tree $(X,\mathfrak{E})$ that satisfies condition (R_λ). Then for $m\geq 1$ and $\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{J}_m$,*

$$F_m(\vartheta,\mathbf{x})=\frac{c(\mathbf{x}^-,\mathbf{x})\lambda^{m-1}}{m(\vartheta)}\ . \tag{4.5}$$

Proof. For $\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}\in X_m$, we let $\pi=[\mathbf{x}_0,\cdots,\mathbf{x}_k]$ in $X_m\setminus\mathcal{J}_m$ start from $\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{x}_0$ and end at $\mathbf{y}=\mathbf{x}_k$, and $w(\pi)=P(\mathbf{x}_0,\mathbf{x}_1)\cdots P(\mathbf{x}_{k-1},\mathbf{x}_k)$ be the weight of the path; the trivial path $\pi=[\mathbf{x}]$ has weight 1 by convention; we also use $\prod_m(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$ to denote the class of paths from $\mathbf{x}$ to $\mathbf{y}$ in X_m. Observe that for $\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}\in X_m\setminus\mathcal{J}_m$, $m(\mathbf{x})P(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})=m(\mathbf{y})P(\mathbf{y},\mathbf{x})(=c(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}))$. Hence for any path π that starts from $\mathbf{x}$ and ends at $\mathbf{y}$, by letting π' be the path in the reversed direction of π, we have $m(\mathbf{x})w(\pi)=m(\mathbf{y})w(\pi')$.

For $\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{J}_m$, by applying the above to $\mathbf{x}^-$ and ϑ, together with Proposition 4.1 and Lemma 4.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F_m(\vartheta,\mathbf{x}) &= P(\mathbf{x}^-,\mathbf{x})\sum\nolimits_{\pi\in\Pi_m(\vartheta,\mathbf{x}^-)} w(\pi) \\ &= P(\mathbf{x}^-,\mathbf{x})\frac{m(\mathbf{x}^-)}{m(\vartheta)}\sum\nolimits_{\pi'\in\Pi_m(\mathbf{x}^-,\vartheta)} w(\pi') \\ &= \frac{c(\mathbf{x}^-,\mathbf{x})}{m(\vartheta)}G_m(\mathbf{x}^-,\vartheta) \\ &= \frac{c(\mathbf{x}^-,\mathbf{x})}{m(\vartheta)}F_m(\mathbf{x}^-,\vartheta)G_m(\vartheta,\vartheta) \\ &= \frac{c(\mathbf{x}^-,\mathbf{x})}{m(\vartheta)}\cdot\frac{\lambda^{m-1}-\lambda^m}{1-\lambda^m}\cdot\frac{1-\lambda^m}{1-\lambda} \ =\ \frac{c(\mathbf{x}^-,\mathbf{x})\lambda^{m-1}}{m(\vartheta)}\ . \end{aligned}$$

□

In view of the expression of $F_m(\vartheta, \mathbf{x})$ in (4.5), we will introduce a class of conductance $c(x, y)$ so that the limits exist as $m \to \infty$. (We can not just take the limit, as $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{J}_m$ depends on m.)

Definition 4.4. *Let $(X, \mathfrak{E})$ be a pre-augmented tree of an IFS $\{S_i\}_{j=1}^N$. A reversible random walk $\{Z_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ on $(X, \mathfrak{E})$ with conductance $c : X \times X \to [0, \infty)$ is called* quasi-natural *with return ratio $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ (λ-QNRW) if for a set of probability weights $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^N$,*

(i) $c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^-) = p_{\mathbf{x}} \lambda^{-m}$, *for* $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{J}_m$, $m \geq 1$, *where* $p_{\mathbf{x}} = p_{i_1} \cdots p_{i_m}$ *if* $\mathbf{x} = i_1 \cdots i_m$,

(ii) $c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \asymp c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^-)$ *for* $\mathbf{y} \sim_h \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{J}_m$, $m \geq 1$, *and*

(iii) $c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = 0$ *if* $\mathbf{y} \not\sim \mathbf{x}$.

(Here the bounds of $\asymp$ are independent of $\mathcal{J}_m$, $m \geq 1$). Furthermore if the IFS satisfies the OSC, and $p_i = r_i^\alpha$, the natural weights of the IFS, then we call $\{Z_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ a natural random walk *with return ratio λ (λ-NRW) on $(X, \mathfrak{E})$.*

For a homogeneous IFS, using $\Sigma^n = \mathcal{J}_n$, it is direct to check from $P(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \frac{c(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})}{m(\mathbf{x})}$, $\mathbf{x} \sim \mathbf{y}$ that $P(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^-) = C_{\mathbf{x}} \lambda$, and $P(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}i) = C_{\mathbf{x}} p_i$ for some $C_{\mathbf{x}} > 0$. Clearly the walk has constant return ratio λ. More generally, we have

Proposition 4.5. *Let $\{Z_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ be a λ-QNRW on the pre-augmented tree $(X, \mathfrak{E})$. Then $\{Z_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ satisfies condition (R_λ). Also $m(\vartheta) = \lambda^{-1}$ and if $(X, \mathfrak{E})$ is of bounded degree, then*

$$m(\mathbf{x}) \asymp c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^-), \qquad \mathbf{x} \in X. \tag{4.6}$$

Proof. For $\mathbf{x} \in X \setminus \{\vartheta\}$, by (4.1), we have

$$\lambda(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{p_{\mathbf{x}} \lambda^{-|\mathbf{x}|}}{\sum\limits_{\mathbf{y}:\mathbf{y}^-=\mathbf{x}} p_{\mathbf{y}} \lambda^{-(|\mathbf{x}|+1)}} = \frac{\lambda p_{\mathbf{x}}}{\sum\limits_{\mathbf{y}:\mathbf{y}^-=\mathbf{x}} p_{\mathbf{y}}} = \lambda.$$

Hence the walk satisfies condition (R_λ). Also, $m(\vartheta) = \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{J}_1} p_{\mathbf{y}} \lambda^{-1} = \lambda^{-1}$, and by the bounded degree assumption,

$$\begin{aligned} m(x) &= c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^-) + \sum_{\mathbf{y}:\mathbf{y}^-=\mathbf{x}} c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) + \sum_{\mathbf{y} \sim_h \mathbf{x}} c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \\ &\asymp c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^-) + \lambda^{-1} c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^-) + \#\{\mathbf{y} : \ \mathbf{y} \sim_h \mathbf{x}\} c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^-) \asymp c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^-). \end{aligned}$$

□

We now apply the previous results developed in the section to make the following conclusion.

Theorem 4.6. *Let $\{Z_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ be a λ-QNRW on a pre-augmented tree $(X, \mathfrak{E})$ with bounded degree. Then*

$$F_m(\vartheta, \mathbf{x}) = p_{\mathbf{x}}, \qquad \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{J}_m, \tag{4.7}$$

Furthermore, $F(\vartheta, \mathbf{x}) \asymp p_{\mathbf{x}}$ (the bounds depend on λ) for any $\mathbf{x} \in X$.

Proof. For $m \geq 1$ and for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{J}_m$, Propositions 4.3 and 4.5 imply that

$$F_m(\vartheta, \mathbf{x}) = \frac{c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^-)\lambda^{m-1}}{m(\vartheta)} = \frac{p_{\mathbf{x}}\lambda^{-m} \cdot \lambda^{m-1}}{\lambda^{-1}} = p_{\mathbf{x}}.$$

For $F(\vartheta, \mathbf{x})$, we cannot take limit directly as $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{J}_m$ depends on m. Instead, we observe that

$$F(\vartheta, \mathbf{x}) \geq F_m(\vartheta, \mathbf{x}) = p_{\mathbf{x}}.$$

Also, note that P is reversible, and hence $m(\mathbf{x})G(\mathbf{x}, \vartheta) = m(\vartheta)G(\vartheta, \mathbf{x})$ for any vertex $\mathbf{x} \in X$. Therefore for $\mathbf{x} \in X \setminus \{\vartheta\}$, by Proposition 4.1, Lemma 4.2 and Proposition 4.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F(\vartheta, \mathbf{x}) = \frac{G(\vartheta, \mathbf{x})}{G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})} \;&\leq\; G(\vartheta, \mathbf{x}) \qquad\qquad (\text{by } G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) \geq 1) \\ &= \frac{m(\mathbf{x})}{m(\vartheta)} G(\mathbf{x}, \vartheta) \;\leq\; C_1 p_{\mathbf{x}} \lambda^{-|\mathbf{x}|} F(\mathbf{x}, \vartheta) G(\vartheta, \vartheta) \\ &= C_1 p_{\mathbf{x}} \lambda^{-|\mathbf{x}|} \cdot \Big(\lambda^{|\mathbf{x}|} \cdot \frac{1}{1-\lambda}\Big) \;=\; \frac{C_1}{1-\lambda}\, p_{\mathbf{x}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $F(\vartheta, \mathbf{x}) \asymp p_{\mathbf{x}}$. □

To conclude this section, we give two remarks on the λ-QNRW.

Remark 1. In general, we cannot expect a λ-QNRW to have the *strict reversibility* property (i.e., $0 < M^{-1} \leq c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq M$ for any $\mathbf{x} \sim \mathbf{y}$). More precisely, we can show that if the IFS satisfies the OSC, then a strictly reversible λ-QNRW implies that $\lambda = r^{\alpha}$, where $r = \min_{1 \leq i \leq N} r_i$.

Indeed, suppose the strict reversibility holds, and let $c(\mathcal{J}_m) = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{J}_m} c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^-)$, $m \geq 0$. Then by (4.1), we have $c(\mathcal{J}_{m+1}) = \lambda^{-m} c(\mathcal{J}_1) = \lambda^{-m} m(\vartheta)$. Recall that $r^{-\alpha m} \leq \#\mathcal{J}_m < r^{-\alpha(m+1)}$ where α satisfies $\sum_{i=1}^{N} r_i^{\alpha} = 1$ (Lemma 3.1). Hence

$$0 < M^{-1} \leq \frac{c(\mathcal{J}_{m+1})}{\#\mathcal{J}_{m+1}} \leq \frac{\lambda^{-m} m(\vartheta)}{r^{-\alpha(m+1)}}, \qquad m \geq 0.$$

This implies $\lambda \leq r^{\alpha}$. On the other hand,

$$M \geq \frac{c(\mathcal{J}_{m+1})}{\#\mathcal{J}_{m+1}} \geq \frac{\lambda^{-m} m(\vartheta)}{r^{-\alpha(m+2)}}, \qquad m \geq 0$$

yields $\lambda \geq r^\alpha$, and hence $\lambda = r^\alpha$. It follows that in Definition 4.4(i), we must have $p_i = r_i^\alpha$, the natural weight to have the strict reversibility property.

Remark 2. Conditions (i) and (ii) of the λ-QNRW imply $c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^-) \asymp c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \asymp c(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}^-)$ for $\mathbf{x} \sim_h \mathbf{y}$. It follows that $p_\mathbf{x} \asymp p_\mathbf{y}$ for all $\mathbf{x} \sim_h \mathbf{y}$, and hence imposes a strong restriction on the choice of probability weights $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^N$. For the λ-NRW, this restriction is fulfilled, as the natural weights satisfy $p_\mathbf{x} = r_\mathbf{x}^\alpha \asymp r^{\alpha|\mathbf{x}|}$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in X$. In particular, for a homogeneous IFS that satisfies the OSC and has contraction ratio r, the SRW on a pre-augmented tree $(X, \mathfrak{E})$ is a $\frac{1}{N}$-NRW, as $p_i = 1/N = r^\alpha$, $\lambda = N^{-1}$ and $c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^-) = 1$.

However for the λ-QNRW, we have to choose special probability weights to satisfy $p_\mathbf{x} \asymp p_\mathbf{y}$, $\mathbf{x} \sim_h \mathbf{y}$. For instance, if K is the d-dimensional Sierpinski gasket in Example 3.6, one can derive from $p_\mathbf{x} \asymp p_\mathbf{y}$, $\mathbf{x} \sim_h \mathbf{y}$ that all p_i's are equal. Hence the λ-QNRW on the corresponding augmented tree must be the λ-NRW.

Example 4.7. If K is the Sierpinski carpet, and the IFS is $\{S_i\}_{i=1}^8$ on $\mathbb{R}^2$, where $S_i(z) = (z + q_i)/2$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, 8$, and the q_i's are the four vertices and four mid-points of the edges of a square, and is labeled clockwise starting from the top left corner. Consider the pre-agumented tree $(X, \mathfrak{E})$ with $\mathfrak{E}_h$ defined by $\mathbf{x} \sim_h \mathbf{y}$ if $|\mathbf{x}| = |\mathbf{y}|$ and $\dim_{\mathrm{H}}\big(K_\mathbf{x} \cap K_\mathbf{y}\big) = 1$. Then it is direct to check that one obtains a λ-QNRW with probability weight $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^8$ on $(X, \mathfrak{E})$ if and only if $p_1 = p_3 = p_5 = p_7$, $p_2 = p_6$, and $p_4 = p_8$. Note that with this weight, the self-similar measure is a doubling measure [Y], i.e, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for any $\xi \in K$ and any $\delta > 0$, we have $\mu(B(\xi; 2\delta)) \leq C\mu(B(\xi; \delta))$.

In general, we can make use of a result in [Y] to obtain the following characterization for the probability weight $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^N$ that admits a λ-QNRW.

Theorem 4.8. *Let $\{S_i\}_{i=1}^N$ be an IFS with OSC, let K be the self-similar set, and let μ be the self-similar measure generated by $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^N$. Then $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^N$ admits a λ-QNRW on the augmented tree $(X, \mathfrak{E})$ if and only if μ is a doubling measure on K.*

Proof. Let $K_\mathbf{x}$ denote $S_\mathbf{x}(K)$. For $F \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, let $|F| = \mathrm{diam}(F)$, and $B(F; \delta) := \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d : \mathrm{dist}(\xi, F) \leq \delta\}$ denote the closed δ-neighborhood of F. Consider the following two conditions:

(i) if there exist constants C_1, $C_2 > 0$ such that for any $\mathbf{w}$, $\mathbf{v} \in \Sigma^* \setminus \{\vartheta\}$ that satisfy $K_\mathbf{w} \subseteq B(K_\mathbf{v};\ C_1 r_\mathbf{v})$, then $p_\mathbf{w} \leq C_2 p_\mathbf{v}$;

(ii) Replace the quantifiers of (i) to "if for any $C_1 > 0$, there exists $C_2 > 0$ such that ..." .

In [Y, Theorem 2.3], it is proved that (i) $\Rightarrow$ μ is a doubling measure $\Rightarrow$ (ii). We will prove (ii) $\Rightarrow$ $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^N$ admits a QNRW $\Rightarrow$ (i). Hence all four conditions are equivalent, and yields the theorem.

Assume (ii) and let $C_1 = (\gamma + |K|)r^{-1}$, where $r = \min_{1\le i\le N} r_i$, and γ is as in (3.5). Then by (3.5), $\mathbf{x} \sim_h \mathbf{y}$ implies

$$\begin{aligned} K_{\mathbf{x}} \subseteq & B(K_{\mathbf{y}};\ \gamma r^{|\mathbf{x}|} + r_{\mathbf{x}}|K|) \\ \subseteq & B(K_{\mathbf{y}};\ (\gamma + |K|)r^{|\mathbf{x}|}) \subseteq B(K_{\mathbf{y}};\ C_1 r_{\mathbf{y}}). \end{aligned}$$

Then by (ii), $p_{\mathbf{x}} \le C_2 p_{\mathbf{y}}$ for some $C_2 > 0$; by the same reason, $p_{\mathbf{y}} \le C_2 p_{\mathbf{x}}$. Hence for $0 < \lambda < 1$, $c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^-) = p_{\mathbf{x}}\lambda^{-|\mathbf{x}|} \asymp p_{\mathbf{y}}\lambda^{-|\mathbf{y}|} = c(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}^-)$ for all $\mathbf{x} \sim_h \mathbf{y}$. We can choose, for instance, $c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sqrt{c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^-)c(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}^-)}$ to get a λ-QNRW on $(X, \mathfrak{E})$.

Next we assume $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^N$ admits a λ-QNRW on $(X, \mathfrak{E})$. We first define an integer $N_0 = \lceil \log r / \log r' \rceil$ where $r' = \max_{1\le i\le N} r_i$. Then for $p = \min_{1\le i\le N} p_i$, and for any $\mathbf{z} \in X$, we have $p_{\mathbf{z}} \ge p^{N_0} p_{\mathbf{z}^-}$ since the difference of the length of the words $\mathbf{z}$ and $\mathbf{z}^-$ is at most N_0.

The λ-QNRW implies that $p_{\mathbf{x}}\lambda^{-|\mathbf{x}|} = c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^-) \asymp c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \asymp c(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}^-) = p_{\mathbf{y}}\lambda^{-|\mathbf{y}|}$ for any $\mathbf{x} \sim_h \mathbf{y}$. Therefore there exists $C > 0$ such that $p_{\mathbf{x}} \le C p_{\mathbf{y}}$ for any $\mathbf{x} \sim_h \mathbf{y}$. Let $C_1 = \min\{\gamma, (1-r)(2r)^{-1}|K|\} > 0$. It follows that for any $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{J}_m$,

$$\begin{aligned} |B(K_{\mathbf{y}};\ C_1 r_{\mathbf{y}})| &\le |K_{\mathbf{y}}| + 2C_1 r_{\mathbf{y}} \\ &\le (1 + 2(1-r)(2r)^{-1})r^m|K| = r^{m-1}|K|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence for $\mathbf{x} \in X$ such that $K_{\mathbf{x}} \subseteq B(K_{\mathbf{y}};\ C_1 r_{\mathbf{y}})$, $|\mathbf{x}| \ge m - 1$ (by (3.2)). We claim that $p_{\mathbf{x}} \le C p^{-N_0} p_{\mathbf{y}}$. Indeed, let $\mathbf{x}_m \in \mathcal{J}_m$ such that it is on the same vertical path of $\mathbf{x}$. Then either $K_{\mathbf{x}} \subseteq K_{\mathbf{x}_m}$ or $K_{\mathbf{x}_m} \subseteq K_{\mathbf{x}}$. We have three distinct cases:

(a) If $\mathbf{x}_m = \mathbf{y}$, then $p_{\mathbf{x}} \le p_{\mathbf{y}^-} \le p^{-N_0} p_{\mathbf{y}}$.

(b) If $\mathbf{x}_m \ne \mathbf{y}$ and $|\mathbf{x}| = m - 1$, then $\mathbf{x}_m^- = \mathbf{x}$ and $K_{\mathbf{x}_m} \subseteq K_{\mathbf{x}} \subseteq B(K_{\mathbf{y}};\ C_1 r_{\mathbf{y}})$, which implies $\operatorname{dist}(K_{\mathbf{x}_m}, K_{\mathbf{y}}) \le C_1 r_{\mathbf{y}} \le \gamma r^m$, hence $\mathbf{x}_m \sim_h \mathbf{y}$. This shows that $p_{\mathbf{x}} \le p^{-N_0} p_{\mathbf{x}_m} \le C p^{-N_0} p_{\mathbf{y}}$.

(c) If $\mathbf{x}_m \ne \mathbf{y}$ and $|\mathbf{x}| \ge m$, then $K_{\mathbf{x}} \subseteq K_{\mathbf{x}_m}$ and $\operatorname{dist}(K_{\mathbf{x}_m}, K_{\mathbf{y}}) \le \operatorname{dist}(K_{\mathbf{x}}, K_{\mathbf{y}}) \le C_1 r_{\mathbf{y}} \le \gamma r^m$, hence $\mathbf{x}_m \sim_h \mathbf{y}$. This shows that $p_{\mathbf{x}} \le p_{\mathbf{x}_m} \le C p_{\mathbf{y}}$.

To conclude the proof, we let $\mathbf{w}$, $\mathbf{v} \in \Sigma^* \setminus \{\vartheta\}$. We can choose $\mathbf{u}$, $\mathbf{t} \in X$ such that $S_{\mathbf{u}}(K) \subseteq K_{\mathbf{w}} \subseteq K_{\mathbf{u}^-}$, and $K_{\mathbf{t}} \subseteq K_{\mathbf{v}} \subseteq K_{\mathbf{t}^-}$. If $K_{\mathbf{w}} \subseteq B(K_{\mathbf{v}};\ C_1 r_{\mathbf{v}})$ as in the assumption in condition (i), then $K_{\mathbf{u}} \subseteq B(K_{\mathbf{t}^-};\ C_1 r_{\mathbf{t}^-})$, hence

$$p_{\mathbf{w}} \le p_{\mathbf{u}^-} \le p^{-N_0} p_{\mathbf{u}} \le C p^{-2N_0} p_{\mathbf{t}^-} \le C p^{-3N_0} p_{\mathbf{t}} \le C p^{-3N_0} p_{\mathbf{v}}.$$

Let $C_2 = C p^{-3N_0}$. Then (i) follows. □

5 Martin boundary and hitting distribution

In this section, we focus on the quasi-natural random walk on augmented trees. We first show that Ancona's Theorem (Theorem 2.5) can be applied to identify the Martin boundary with the self-similar set.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $(X, \mathfrak{E})$ be a pre-augmented tree which is hyperbolic and has bounded degree, and let $\{Z_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ be a λ-QNRW on $(X, \mathfrak{E})$. Then the transition probability P satisfies the hypotheses in Theorem 2.5. Hence $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_{min}$, and the hyperbolic boundary $\partial_H X$ and $\mathcal{M}$ are homeomorphic under the canonical mapping.*

In particular, if the IFS satisfies the OSC, and $(X, \mathfrak{E})$ is the augmented tree as in (3.5), then $\partial_H X$, $\mathcal{M}$ and the self-similar set K are all homeomorphic under the canonical mapping.

Proof. We need to check that the conditions in Ancona's theorem (Theorem 2.5) are satisfied. Clearly P is of bounded range. That

$$P(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \frac{c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{m(\mathbf{x})} \geq \eta > 0$$

follows from Definition 4.4 and (4.6). Hence P is uniformly irreducible. It remains to show that $r(P) < 1$. By Proposition 2.6, it suffices to show that (X, P) satisfies the strong isoperimetric inequality.

Consider the subtree $T = (X, \mathfrak{E}_v)$, and restrict the random walk to T. The transition probability is given by $P_T(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^-) = \frac{c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^-)}{m_T(\mathbf{x})}$, and $= 0$ otherwise, where $m_T(\mathbf{x}) = c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^-) + \sum_{\mathbf{y}:\mathbf{y}^- = \mathbf{x}} c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ for $\mathbf{x} \in X \setminus \{\vartheta\}$. Note that $m_T(\vartheta) = m(\vartheta)$. We claim that the transition probability P_T satisfies the following strong isoperimetric inequality:

$$m_T(A) \leq \frac{1+\lambda}{1-\lambda} c_T(\partial A) \tag{5.1}$$

for all finite subsets $A \subseteq X$. To prove the claim, we can first assume that A is nonempty and connected (otherwise check (5.1) for each connected component and then sum them up). We use induction on $n := \min\{m : A \subseteq X_m\}$. It is clear that if $n = 0$, then $A = \{\vartheta\}$ and $m_T(A) = m(\vartheta) = c_T(\partial A)$ implies (5.1). Suppose that for some $n \geq 1$, (5.1) holds for any finite connected subset in X_{n-1}. Consider a connected subset $A \subseteq X$ such that $\min\{m : A \subseteq X_m\} = n$. If $\#A = 1$, then $m_T(A) = c_T(\partial A)$ implies (5.1). Now we suppose $\#A \geq 2$. Then for any $\mathbf{x} \in A \cap \mathcal{J}_n$,

$\mathbf{x}^- \in A$ since T is a tree and A is connected. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
m_T(A) &= m_T(A \setminus \mathcal{J}_n) + m_T(A \cap \mathcal{J}_n) \\
&= m_T(A \setminus \mathcal{J}_n) + \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in A \cap \mathcal{J}_n} \Big(c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^-) + \sum_{\mathbf{y}:\mathbf{y}^- = \mathbf{x}} c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \Big) \\
&= m_T(A \setminus \mathcal{J}_n) + \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in A \cap \mathcal{J}_n} (1 + \lambda^{-1}) c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^-) \qquad \text{(by (4.1))} \\
&\le \frac{1+\lambda}{1-\lambda} \Big(c_T(\partial(A \setminus \mathcal{J}_n)) + \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in A \cap \mathcal{J}_n} (\lambda^{-1} - 1) c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^-) \Big) \quad \text{(by induction)} \\
&= \frac{1+\lambda}{1-\lambda} \Big(c_T(\partial(A \setminus \mathcal{J}_n)) + \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in A \cap \mathcal{J}_n} \big(\sum_{\mathbf{y}:\mathbf{y}^- = \mathbf{x}} c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^-) \big) \Big) \quad \text{(by (4.1))} \\
&= \frac{1+\lambda}{1-\lambda} c_T(\partial A) \qquad \text{(use tree property)}
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the claim. Next observe that for any $\mathbf{x} \in X \setminus \{\vartheta\}$, there exists $C_1 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
m(\mathbf{x}) &\le C_1 p_{\mathbf{x}} \lambda^{-|\mathbf{x}|} = C_1 c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^-) \qquad \text{(by bounded degree and (4.6))} \\
&= \frac{C_1 \lambda}{1+\lambda} \big(\sum_{\mathbf{y}:\mathbf{y}^- = \mathbf{x}} c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) + c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^-) \big) \quad \text{(by (4.1))} \\
&= \frac{C_1 \lambda}{1+\lambda} m_T(\mathbf{x}).
\end{aligned}$$

This together with the claim implies the following strong isoperimetric inequality on $(X, \mathfrak{E})$:

$$m(A) \le \frac{C_1 \lambda}{1+\lambda} m_T(A) \le \frac{C_1 \lambda}{1-\lambda} c_T(\partial A) \le \frac{C_1 \lambda}{1-\lambda} c(\partial A)$$

for all finite subsets $A \subseteq X$.

For the last part, we observe the OSC implies that the the augmented tree $(X, \mathcal{E})$ is of bounded degree (Proposition 3.8), and Theorem 3.5 and the above imply the homeomorphism of K, $\partial_H X$ and $\mathcal{M}$. □

As $r(P) < 1$ in the above proof, we can apply the first part of Theorem 2.5 to obtain the same inequality for $F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ of the λ-QNRW.

Corollary 5.2. *Let $(X, \mathfrak{E})$ be a pre-augmented tree which is hyperbolic and has bounded degree, and let $\{Z_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ be a λ-QNRW on $(X, \mathfrak{E})$. Then for $\delta \ge 0$, there is a constant $C_\delta \ge 1$ such that for any $\mathbf{x}$, $\mathbf{y} \in X$ and $\mathbf{u}$ within distance δ from a geodesic segment between $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{y}$,*

$$F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) F(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}) \le F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \le C_\delta F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) F(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}). \tag{5.2}$$

The above corollary allows us to give a useful estimate for $F(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$ in terms of the Gromov product, which will be essential in the study of the Martin kernel and the Naim kernel in the next few sections. For this, we need to restrict our consideration to IFS satisfying the OSC and the class of natural random walks, with natural weights $p_i = r_i^\alpha, 1 \le i \le N$. In this case, we have $p_{\mathbf{x}} = \mu(S_{\mathbf{x}}(K)) = r_{\mathbf{x}}^\alpha \asymp r^{\alpha m}$ for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{J}_m$, where $r = \min_{1\le i\le N}\{r_i\}$, α is the Hausdorff dimension of K, and μ is the self-similar measure corresponding to $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^N$ (Lemma 3.1).

Theorem 5.3. *Let $\{S_i\}_{i=1}^N$ be an IFS satisfying the OSC, and let $\{Z_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ be a λ-NRW on the augmented tree $(X,\mathfrak{E})$. Then*

$$F(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) \asymp \lambda^{|\mathbf{x}|-(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{y})} r^{\alpha(|\mathbf{y}|-(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{y}))}, \qquad \forall\ \mathbf{x},\mathbf{y} \in X$$

where $(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{y})$ is the Gromov product.

Proof. Following Corollary 5.2, we use C_0 (for $\delta = 0$) to denote the constant in (5.2) whenever $\mathbf{x}$, $\mathbf{y} \in X$ and $\mathbf{u}$ lies on a geodesic segment $\pi(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$. The canonical geodesic between $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{y}$ is

$$\pi(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) = \pi(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{u}) \cup \pi(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) \cup \pi(\mathbf{v},\mathbf{y})$$

with horizontal geodesic $\pi(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})$ and vertical geodesics $\pi(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{u})$ and $\pi(\mathbf{v},\mathbf{y})$. By (5.2),

$$F(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) \ge F(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{u})F(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})F(\mathbf{v},\mathbf{y}) \ge C_0^{-1}\frac{F(\mathbf{x},\vartheta)}{F(\mathbf{u},\vartheta)} \cdot F(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) \cdot C_0^{-1}\frac{F(\vartheta,\mathbf{y})}{F(\vartheta,\mathbf{v})}$$

Since there exists $\eta > 0$ such that $P(\mathbf{w},\mathbf{w}') \ge \eta > 0$ for all $\mathbf{w} \sim \mathbf{w}'$, we see that $F(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) \ge \eta^{d(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})}$ where $d(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})$ is the graph distance of $\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}$. Applying Theorem 4.1 ($F(\mathbf{w},\vartheta) = \lambda^{|\mathbf{w}|}$) and Theorem 4.6 ($F(\vartheta,\mathbf{w}) \asymp r^{\alpha|\mathbf{w}|}$ since the walk is natural) to the other two factors of the above expression, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) &\ge c_1\lambda^{d(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{u})}\eta^{d(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})}r^{\alpha d(\mathbf{v},\mathbf{y})} \\ &= c_1\lambda^{d(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{u})+d(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})/2}(\eta/\sqrt{\lambda r^\alpha})^{d(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})}r^{\alpha(d(\mathbf{v},\mathbf{y})+d(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})/2)} \\ &\ge c_2\lambda^{|\mathbf{x}|-(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{y})}r^{\alpha(|\mathbf{y}|-(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{y}))} \qquad \text{(by (3.4))} \end{aligned}$$

where $c_2 = c_1(\min\{1,\eta/\sqrt{\lambda r^\alpha}\})^M$ and M is the uniform bound for the length of horizontal geodesics of $(X,\mathfrak{E})$ (Proposition 3.3). The other direction of the inequality follows from a similar proof,

$$\begin{aligned} F(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) &\le C_0^2 F(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{u})F(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})F(\mathbf{v},\mathbf{y}) \\ &\le C_0^2\frac{F(\mathbf{x},\vartheta)}{F(\mathbf{u},\vartheta)} \cdot \frac{F(\vartheta,\mathbf{y})}{F(\vartheta,\mathbf{v})} \\ &\le C_1\lambda^{d(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{u})} \cdot r^{\alpha d(\mathbf{v},\mathbf{y})} \\ &\le C_2\lambda^{|\mathbf{x}|-(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{y})}r^{\alpha(|\mathbf{y}|-(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{y}))}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $F(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) \asymp \lambda^{|\mathbf{x}|-(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{y})}r^{\alpha(|\mathbf{y}|-(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{y}))}$ for any $\mathbf{x}$, $\mathbf{y} \in X$. □

Since the Martin kernel satisfies $K(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) = \frac{G(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})}{G(\vartheta,\mathbf{y})} = \frac{F(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})}{F(\vartheta,\mathbf{y})}$, and the Gromov product $(\mathbf{x}|\xi)$ is defined for $\xi \in \partial_H X$ (see (3.6)), Theorem 4.6 implies

Corollary 5.4. *Suppose $\{S_i\}_{i=1}^N$ satisfies OSC, let $\{Z_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ be a λ-NRW on an augmented tree $(X,\mathfrak{E})$. Then we have the following estimate*

$$K(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) \asymp \lambda^{|\mathbf{x}|-(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{y})} r^{-\alpha(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{y})}, \qquad \mathbf{x},\mathbf{y} \in X,$$

and also for $K(\mathbf{x},\xi)$ by replacing $\mathbf{y}$ with $\xi \in \partial_H X (\approx \mathcal{M} \approx K)$ in the above estimate.

In the following, we will assume the IFS satisfies the OSC, and consider the augmented tree $(X,\mathfrak{E})$, which is of bounded degree (Proposition 3.8). By Theorem 5.1, we identify K with the Martin boundary $\mathcal{M}$ of a λ-QNRW $\{Z_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$. We will verify the hitting distribution on $\mathcal{M} \approx K$ starting from the root ϑ.

First we construct a projection $\{Z_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ on X onto K. For $\{S_i\}_{i=1}^N$ satisfying the OSC, we let O be an open set in the OSC such that $O \cap K \neq \emptyset$ [Sc]. Define a projection $\iota : X \to K$ by selecting arbitrarily

$$\iota(\mathbf{x}) \in S_{\mathbf{x}}(O \cap K), \quad \mathbf{x} \in X.$$

If we extend ι to $\widehat{X} = X \cup \mathcal{M}$ by defining $\iota(\xi) = \xi$ for $\xi \in \mathcal{M}(\approx K)$, then a sequence $\{\mathbf{x}_n\}_n \subseteq X$ with $|\mathbf{x}_n| \to \infty$ converges to $\xi \in \widehat{X}$ if and only if $\iota(\mathbf{x}_n) \to \iota(\xi) \in K$ in the Euclidean topology. Hence ι is continuous on $\widehat{X}$, and $\iota|_{\mathcal{M}}$ is the canonical homeomorphism of $\mathcal{M}$ onto K; also we have

$$\iota(Z_\infty) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \iota(Z_n) \quad \mathbb{P}_\vartheta - a.e. \tag{5.3}$$

Let ν_ϑ be the distribution of Z_∞, and ν the distribution of $\iota(Z_\infty)$. It is direct to check that $\nu = \nu_\vartheta \circ \iota^{-1}$ on K. For later use, we shall write $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}_\vartheta$ and $\mathbb{E} = \mathbb{E}_\vartheta$.

For $\ell \geq 1$, let $\tau_\ell := \inf\{n \geq 0 : Z_n \in \mathcal{J}_\ell\}$ be the first hitting time to $\mathcal{J}_\ell$. Then by Theorem 4.6, the distribution of Z_{τ_ℓ} is given by

$$\mathbb{P}_\vartheta(Z_{\tau_\ell} = \mathbf{x}) = p_{\mathbf{x}} = \mu(S_{\mathbf{x}}(K)), \quad \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{J}_\ell, \tag{5.4}$$

where μ is the self-similar measure associated with the probability weight $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^N$. Note that under the OSC, $\mu(S_{\mathbf{x}}(K) \cap S_{\mathbf{y}}(K)) = 0$ for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{J}_m,\ \mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{y}$.

Proposition 5.5. *For $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{J}_m$ and $\ell \geq m$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\iota(Z_{\tau_\ell}) \in S_{\mathbf{x}}(K)\big) = \mu(S_{\mathbf{x}}(K)). \tag{5.5}$$

Also $\mathbb{P}\big(\iota(Z_{\tau_\ell}) \in S_{\mathbf{x}}(K) \cap S_{\mathbf{y}}(K)\big) = 0$ for any $\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{J}_m,\ \mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{y}$.

Proof. Let $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{J}_m$, $\mathbf{z} \neq \mathbf{x}$. Since $\iota(\mathbf{z}) \in S_{\mathbf{z}}(O \cap K)$, the OSC implies that $S_{\mathbf{z}}(O) \cap S_{\mathbf{x}}(O) = \emptyset$. Hence $\iota(\mathbf{z}) \notin \overline{S_{\mathbf{x}}(O)} \supset S_{\mathbf{x}}(K)$. It follows that for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{J}_m$ and $\iota(Z_{\tau_\ell}(\omega)) \in S_{\mathbf{x}}(K)$, $\ell \geq m$, $Z_{\tau_\ell}(\omega)$ must be of the form $\mathbf{xu}$ for some $\mathbf{u} \in \Sigma^*$ and $\mathbf{xu} \in \mathcal{J}_\ell$. By (5.4),

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(\iota(Z_{\tau_\ell}) \in S_{\mathbf{x}}(K)) &= \sum_{\mathbf{u}\in\Sigma^*:\mathbf{xu}\in\mathcal{J}_\ell} \mathbb{P}_\vartheta(Z_{\tau_\ell} = \mathbf{xu}) \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{u}\in\Sigma^*:\mathbf{xu}\in\mathcal{J}_\ell} \mu(S_{\mathbf{xu}}(K)) = \mu(S_{\mathbf{x}}(K)).\end{aligned}$$

By using $\mathbb{P}_\vartheta(Z_{\tau_\ell} = \mathbf{xz},\ Z_{\tau_\ell} = \mathbf{yz}') = 0$ and adopt the same argument, the second part follows. □

To obtain the hitting distribution ν_ϑ, a simple minded approach is to take limit on ℓ in (5.5) to obtain $\mathbb{P}\big(\iota(Z_\infty) \in S_{\mathbf{x}}(K)\big) = \mu(S_{\mathbf{x}}(K))$. However this requires that $\chi_{S_{\mathbf{x}}(K)}(\iota(Z_{\tau_\ell})) \to \chi_{S_{\mathbf{x}}(K)}(\iota(Z_\infty))$ a.e., but we cannot make such conclusion directly, as the general theory of convergence for the composition $f(\iota(Z_{\tau_\ell}))$ requires the continuity of f [BJ]. We need to go through a more detailed analysis as in the following.

Lemma 5.6. *For any two distinct $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{J}_m$, we have*

$$\nu(S_{\mathbf{x}}(K) \cap S_{\mathbf{x}'}(K)) = 0.$$

Proof. For $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{J}_m$, and $k > m$, we let

$$\mathcal{F}_{k,\mathbf{x}} = \{\mathbf{yu} \in \mathcal{J}_k :\ \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{J}_m \setminus \{\mathbf{x}\},\ \mathbf{u} \in \Sigma^*,\ S_{\mathbf{yu}}(K) \cap S_{\mathbf{x}}(K) \neq \emptyset\}$$

Let $F_{k,\mathbf{x}} = \bigcup_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{F}_{k,\mathbf{x}}} S_{\mathbf{w}}(K)$. Then $F_{k,\mathbf{x}}$ is a decreasing sequence of sets on k and the limit set is $\bigcup_{\mathbf{y}\in\mathcal{J}_m\setminus\{\mathbf{x}\}}(S_{\mathbf{y}}(K) \cap S_{\mathbf{x}}(K))$, which is a μ-zero set by the OSC. This implies that $\lim_{k\to\infty} \mu(F_{k,\mathbf{x}}) = 0$.

Let $T_{k,\mathbf{x}} = S_{\mathbf{x}}(K) \bigcup F_{k,\mathbf{x}}$. By a similar argument as in Proposition 5.5, we can show that

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\iota(Z_{\tau_\ell}) \in T_{k,\mathbf{x}} \cap T_{k,\mathbf{y}}\big) = \mu(T_{k,\mathbf{x}} \cap T_{k,\mathbf{y}}) \qquad \text{for } \ell \geq m. \tag{5.6}$$

Observe that $K \setminus T_{k,\mathbf{x}}$ has positive Euclidian distance to $S_{\mathbf{x}}(K)$. Hence $\iota(Z_\infty) \in S_{\mathbf{x}}(K)$ implies that $\iota(Z_n)$ is eventually in $T_{k,\mathbf{x}}$, which means $\lim_{n\to\infty} \chi_{T_{k,\mathbf{x}}}(\iota(Z_n)) = 1$.

Now for two distinct $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{J}_m$, if $S_{\mathbf{x}}(K) \cap S_{\mathbf{x}'}(K) = \emptyset$, then the lemma is true. Hence assume that $S_{\mathbf{x}}(K) \cap S_{\mathbf{x}'}(K) \neq \emptyset$. Let $T_{k,\mathbf{x}}$ and $T_{k,\mathbf{x}'}$ be defined as the above.

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu(S_{\mathbf{x}}(K)\cap S_{\mathbf{x}'}(K)) &= \mathbb{P}(\iota(Z_\infty)\in S_{\mathbf{x}}(K)\cap S_{\mathbf{x}'}(K))\\
&\le \mathbb{E}\left(\liminf_{n\to\infty}\chi_{T_{k,\mathbf{x}}\cap T_{k,\mathbf{x}'}}(\iota(Z_n))\right)\\
&\le \liminf_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{E}\big(\chi_{T_{k,\mathbf{x}}\cap T_{k,\mathbf{x}'}}(\iota(Z_n))\big) \qquad \text{(by Fatou's lemma)}\\
&\le \liminf_{\ell\to\infty}\mathbb{E}\big(\chi_{T_{k,\mathbf{x}}\cap T_{k,\mathbf{x}'}}(\iota(Z_{\tau_\ell}))\big) \qquad \text{(as subsequence)} \qquad (5.7)\\
&= \liminf_{\ell\to\infty}\mathbb{P}(\iota(Z_{\tau_\ell})\in T_{k,\mathbf{x}}\cap T_{k,\mathbf{x}'})\\
&= \mu(T_{k,\mathbf{x}}\cap T_{k,\mathbf{x}'}) \qquad \text{(by (5.6))}.
\end{aligned}$$

By the limit in the first paragraph, we have $\nu(S_{\mathbf{x}}(K)\cap S_{\mathbf{x}'}(K))\le \lim_{k\to\infty}\mu(T_{k,\mathbf{x}}\cap T_{k,\mathbf{x}'}) = \mu((S_{\mathbf{x}}(K)\cap S_{\mathbf{x}'}(K)) = 0$, and this completes the proof. □

Theorem 5.7. *Let $\{S_i\}_{i=1}^N$ be an IFS with the OSC and let K be the self-similar set. Suppose $\{Z_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is a λ-QNRW on the augmented tree $(X,\mathfrak{E})$ associated with a set of probability weights $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^N$. Then the hitting distribution ν_ϑ is the self-similar measure μ with weights $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^N$ on K.*

Proof. To prove the theorem, it suffices to show that for $m\ge 1$, $\nu(S_{\mathbf{x}}(K)) = p_{\mathbf{x}}$, for $\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{J}_m$. Then ν is the unique self-similar measure with the weight $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^N$. To this end, we fix $m\ge 1$ and $\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{J}_m$. Let

$$U_{\mathbf{x}}(K) = S_{\mathbf{x}}(K)\setminus \bigcup_{\mathbf{y}\in\mathcal{J}_m:\mathbf{y}\ne\mathbf{x}} S_{\mathbf{y}}(K)$$

be the 'interior' of the m-cell $S_{\mathbf{x}}(K)$. Then any sequence of points in K that has a limit in $U_{\mathbf{x}}(K)$ must be in $U_{\mathbf{x}}(K)$ eventually. Therefore $\iota(Z_\infty)\in U_{\mathbf{x}}(K)$ implies $\lim_{n\to\infty}\chi_{U_{\mathbf{x}}(K)}(\iota(Z_n)) = 1$. Hence by using Fatou's lemma as in Lemma 5.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu(S_{\mathbf{x}}(K)) &= \nu(U_{\mathbf{x}}(K)) \qquad \text{(by Lemma 5.6)}\\
&= \mathbb{P}(\iota(Z_\infty)\in U_{\mathbf{x}}(K))\\
&\le \liminf_{\ell\to\infty}\mathbb{P}(\iota(Z_{\tau_\ell})\in U_{\mathbf{x}}(K)) \quad \text{(as in (5.7))}\\
&\le \liminf_{\ell\to\infty}\mathbb{P}(\iota(Z_{\tau_\ell})\in S_{\mathbf{x}}(K))\\
&= \mu(S_{\mathbf{x}}(K)) = p_{\mathbf{x}} \qquad \text{(by Proposition 5.5)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Summing the above inequality over $\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{J}_m$, we have $1=\nu(K)\le\sum_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{J}_m}\nu(S_{\mathbf{x}}(K))\le\sum_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{J}_m}p_{\mathbf{x}}=1$. Thus $\nu(S_{\mathbf{x}}(K)) = p_{\mathbf{x}}$ for $\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{J}_m$. This completes the proof of the theorem. □

6 Estimation of the Naim kernel

In this section, we will study Naim's Θ-*kernel*, which was first introduced in [Na] on classical potential theory, and was investigated by Silverstein [Si] for the transient reversible random walks reaching the boundaries at ∞. Here we give the explicit estimate of $\Theta(\xi,\eta)$ for the λ-NRW on the boundary $\mathcal{M}\approx K$.

Let P be a transient reversible random walk on a countable set X. For $\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}\in X$, we define the Θ-kernel by

$$\Theta(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})=\frac{K(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})}{G(\mathbf{x},\vartheta)}.$$

This kernel is clearly positive and symmetric (by $m(\mathbf{x})G(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})=m(\mathbf{y})G(\mathbf{y},\mathbf{x})$) on $X\times X$, and can be extended to $\Theta(\mathbf{x},\eta)$ on $X\times\widehat{X}$ continuously (as $K(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$ does (see Section 2)). In the following, we summarize the extension of $\Theta(\xi,\eta)$ on $\widehat{X}\times\widehat{X}$ [Si]. For $\xi\in\mathcal{M}$, we define the ξ-*process* by setting the transition probability

$$P^{\xi}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})=\frac{P(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})K(\mathbf{y},\xi)}{K(\mathbf{x},\xi)}. \tag{6.1}$$

(It is also known as the *h-transform* of P [Dy], by taking a harmonic function $h=K(\cdot,\xi)$ on X.) Clearly P^{ξ} is a transition probability since $K(\cdot,\xi)$ is harmonic on X. In the ξ-process, we denote the corresponding ever-visiting probability and Green function by $F^{\xi}(\cdot,\cdot)$ and $G^{\xi}(\cdot,\cdot)$ respectively. Then for any $\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}\in X$,

$$F^{\xi}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})=\frac{F(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})K(\mathbf{y},\xi)}{K(\mathbf{x},\xi)},\qquad G^{\xi}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})=\frac{G(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})K(\mathbf{y},\xi)}{K(\mathbf{x},\xi)}. \tag{6.2}$$

The following lemma can be found in [Wo2] (Corollary 7.51):

Lemma 6.1. *For $\xi\in\mathcal{M}$, let ν_{ϑ}^{ξ} be the hitting distribution of the ξ-process. Then $\xi\in\mathcal{M}_{\min}$ if and only if the distribution $\nu_{\vartheta}^{\xi}=\delta_{\xi}$ is the point mass concentrated at ξ.*

For $m\geq 0$, let τ_m^* be the last visit time of $X_m=\bigcup_{k=0}^{m}\mathcal{J}_k$ by $\{Z_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$. Note that τ_m^* is not a stopping time. For $\xi\in K$ and $\mathbf{z}\in X$, let

$$\ell_m^{\xi}(\mathbf{z})=\mathbb{P}_{\vartheta}^{\xi}(Z_{\tau_m^*}=\mathbf{z}),$$

where $\mathbb{P}_{\vartheta}^{\xi}$ is the probability corresponding to the ξ-process. The following lemma is from Lemma 1.9 of [Si].

Lemma 6.2. *Let $\xi,\eta\in\mathcal{M}$. Then the sum $\sum_{\mathbf{z}\in X}\ell_m^{\xi}(\mathbf{z})\Theta(\mathbf{z},\eta)$ is increasing on m.*

In view of Lemmas 6.1, 6.2, Silverstein [Si] defined the Naim kernel on $\mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M}$ by

$$\Theta(\xi, \eta) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \sum\nolimits_{\mathbf{z}\in X} \ell_k^{\xi}(\mathbf{z})\Theta(\mathbf{z}, \eta), \quad \xi, \eta \in \mathcal{M}. \tag{6.3}$$

It can be shown that the extension is still symmetric. We will apply this to the λ-NRW on the augmented tree. Since the walk satisfies $|Z_{n+1} - Z_n| \in \{0, \pm 1\}$, (6.3) reduces to $\Theta(\xi, \eta) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \sum_{\mathbf{z}\in\mathcal{J}_k} \ell_k^{\xi}(\mathbf{z})\Theta(\mathbf{z}, \eta)$. Now we state our main theorem in this section.

Theorem 6.3. *Let $\{S_i\}_{i=1}^N$ be an IFS that satisfies the OSC, and let K be the self-similar set. Let $\{Z_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ be a λ-NRW on the augmented tree $(X, \mathfrak{E})$. Then*

$$\Theta(\xi, \eta) \asymp (\lambda r^{\alpha})^{-(\xi|\eta)}, \quad \xi, \eta \in \partial_H X,\ \xi \neq \eta,$$

where $\alpha = \dim_H K$. Consequently, by Theorem 3.5, we have

$$\Theta(\xi, \eta) \asymp |\xi - \eta|^{-(\alpha+\beta)}, \quad \xi, \eta \in K,\ \xi \neq \eta,$$

with $\beta = \frac{\log \lambda}{\log r}$.

Proof. For $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in X$, Theorem 4.1 and Corollary 5.4 imply

$$\Theta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \frac{K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{G(\mathbf{x}, \vartheta)} = \frac{K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{F(\mathbf{x}, \vartheta)G(\vartheta, \vartheta)} \asymp (\lambda r^{\alpha})^{-(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{y})},$$

and by (3.6), we have

$$\Theta(\mathbf{x}, \eta) \asymp (\lambda r^{\alpha})^{-(\mathbf{x}|\eta)}, \qquad \mathbf{x} \in X,\ \eta \in \partial_H X. \tag{6.4}$$

In the following we show that $\Theta(\xi, \eta) \asymp (\lambda r^{\alpha})^{-(\xi|\eta)}$ for any $\xi, \eta \in \partial_H X$, $\xi \neq \eta$. We choose two geodesic rays $(\mathbf{x}_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$ and $(\mathbf{y}_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$ starting from ϑ such that $(\mathbf{x}_n)$ tends to ξ, $(\mathbf{y}_n)$ tends to η, and $(\xi|\eta) = \lim_{n\to\infty}(\mathbf{x}_n|\mathbf{y}_n)$.

We first estimate the lower bound of $\Theta(\xi, \eta)$. Let M be the maximal length of horizontal geodesics in $(X, \mathfrak{E})$ (by Proposition 3.3). Following the proof of Lemma 3.9(iii), there exists a positive integer m_0 such that for any $n \geq m_0$, $d(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{y}_n) > M$ and $(\xi|\eta) = (\mathbf{x}_n|\mathbf{y}_n)$.

Let $T_{m_0} = S_{\mathbf{x}_{m_0}}(K) \cup (\bigcup_{\mathbf{y}\sim_h \mathbf{x}_{m_0}} S_{\mathbf{y}}(K))$. Let $\mathbf{z} \in \iota^{-1}(T_{m_0})$, $|\mathbf{z}| \geq m_0$, by Lemma 3.9(ii),(iii) and the definition of Gromov product,

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathbf{z}|\eta) &\geq (\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{y}_{m_0}) = (\mathbf{z}_{m_0}|\mathbf{y}_{m_0}) \\ &\geq (\mathbf{x}_{m_0}|\mathbf{y}_{m_0}) - \frac{d(\mathbf{x}_{m_0}, \mathbf{z}_{m_0})}{2} \\ &\geq (\mathbf{x}_{m_0}|\mathbf{y}_{m_0}) - \frac{1}{2} = (\xi|\eta) - \frac{1}{2},\end{aligned} \tag{6.5}$$

where $\mathbf{z}_{m_0}$ is the unique vertex in $\mathcal{J}_{m_0}$ such that $\pi(\mathbf{z}_{m_0}, \mathbf{z})$ is a vertical geodesic. Let $\mathbb{P}^\xi = \mathbb{P}^\xi_\vartheta \circ \iota^{-1}$. As we identify K with $\mathcal{M}$ (Theorem 5.1), by Lemma 6.1, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \iota(Z_n) = \xi, \quad \mathbb{P}^\xi - a.e.$$

Let $t_\xi = \sup\{n \geq m_0 : \iota(Z_n) \notin T_{m_0}\} + 1$ be the first time that Z_n enters $\iota^{-1}(T_{m_0})$ and then stays inside. Clearly $\mathbb{P}^\xi(t_\xi < \infty) = 1$. Therefore there exists a positive integer $m_1 > m_0$ such that $\mathbb{P}^\xi(t_\xi \leq m_1) \geq 1/2$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\Theta(\xi,\eta) &\geq \sum\nolimits_{\mathbf{z}\in\mathcal{J}_{m_1}} \ell^\xi_{m_1}(\mathbf{z})\Theta(\mathbf{z},\eta) && \text{(by Lemma 6.2)}\\
&\geq c_1 \sum\nolimits_{\mathbf{z}\in\mathcal{J}_{m_1}\cap\, \iota^{-1}(T_{m_0})} \ell^\xi_{m_1}(\mathbf{z})(\lambda r^\alpha)^{-(\mathbf{z}|\eta)} && \text{(by (6.4))}\\
&\geq c_1(\lambda r^\alpha)^{-(\xi|\eta)+1/2} \sum\nolimits_{\mathbf{z}\in\mathcal{J}_{m_1}\cap\, \iota^{-1}(T_{m_0})} \ell^\xi_{m_1}(\mathbf{z}) && \text{(by (6.5))}\\
&\geq c_2(\lambda r^\alpha)^{-(\xi|\eta)} \cdot \mathbb{P}^\xi(t_\xi \leq \tau^*_{m_1})\\
&\geq c_2(\lambda r^\alpha)^{-(\xi|\eta)} \cdot \mathbb{P}^\xi(t_\xi \leq m_1)\\
&\geq c_3(\lambda r^\alpha)^{-(\xi|\eta)}.
\end{aligned}$$

For the upper bound, we need more estimates on the limit in (6.3). For $k \geq 1$ and $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{J}_k$,

$$\ell^\xi_k(\mathbf{z}) \leq F^\xi(\vartheta,\mathbf{z}) \leq G^\xi(\vartheta,\mathbf{z}) = G(\vartheta,\mathbf{z})K(\mathbf{z},\xi).$$

Using the reversibility $G(\vartheta,\mathbf{z}) = (m(\mathbf{z})/m(\vartheta))G(\mathbf{z},\vartheta)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Theta(\xi,\eta) &= \lim_{k\to\infty} \sum_{\mathbf{z}\in\mathcal{J}_k} \ell^\xi_k(\mathbf{z})\Theta(\mathbf{z},\eta)\\
&\leq (m(\vartheta))^{-1} \lim_{k\to\infty} \sum_{\mathbf{z}\in\mathcal{J}_k} m(\mathbf{z})K(\mathbf{z},\xi)K(\mathbf{z},\eta)\\
&\asymp \lim_{k\to\infty} \sum_{\mathbf{z}\in\mathcal{J}_k} (\lambda r^\alpha)^{|\mathbf{z}|-(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}_k)-(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{y}_k)} && \text{(by Prop 4.5, Cor 5.4 and Lem 3.9(ii))}\\
&= \lim_{k\to\infty} \sum_{\mathbf{z}\in\mathcal{J}_k} (\lambda r^\alpha)^{(d(\mathbf{z},\mathbf{x}_k)+d(\mathbf{z},\mathbf{y}_k))/2-k}\\
&=: \lim_{k\to\infty} \sum_{\mathbf{z}\in\mathcal{J}_k} \Phi(\mathbf{z}).
\end{aligned}$$

Now it suffices to find the upper bound of the sum $\sum_{\mathbf{z}\in\mathcal{J}_k} \Phi(\mathbf{z})$ for arbitrary $k \geq 1$. First we have a simple estimate, by Lemma 3.9(iii) and the triangle inequality,

$$\Phi(\mathbf{z}) \leq (\lambda r^\alpha)^{d(\mathbf{x}_k,\mathbf{y}_k)/2-k} = (\lambda r^\alpha)^{-(\mathbf{x}_k|\mathbf{y}_k)} \leq (\lambda r^\alpha)^{-(\xi|\eta)}, \quad \mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{J}_k. \tag{6.6}$$

For $k \geq 1$, we restrict the graph metric to the subgraph induced by $\mathcal{J}_k$ and denote it by d_k. If $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{J}_k$ are not connected in the subgraph induced by $\mathcal{J}_k$, then

we set $d_k(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})=\infty$. For $\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{J}_k$, $k\geq 1$, let $\mathcal{F}_k(\mathbf{x})=\{\mathbf{y}\in\mathcal{J}_k : d_k(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\leq M\}$, where M is the maximal length of the horizontal geodesics. As $(X,\mathfrak{E})$ is of bounded degree (Lemma 3.8), it is direct to check that $\#\mathcal{F}_k(\mathbf{x})\leq C_1$ for some $C_1>0$.

Let $\mathcal{F}_k^c=\mathcal{J}_k\setminus(\mathcal{F}_k(\mathbf{x}_k)\cup\mathcal{F}_k(\mathbf{y}_k))$, and observe that $\mathcal{F}_{k_0}^c\neq\emptyset$ for some k_0. We claim that for any $\mathbf{z}\in\mathcal{F}_k^c$ and $\mathbf{z}^{(1)}$ the offspring of $\mathbf{z}$ in $\mathcal{J}_{k+1}$, then $\mathbf{z}^{(1)}\in\mathcal{F}_{k+1}^c$ and $d(\mathbf{z}^{(1)},\mathbf{x}_{k+1})=d(\mathbf{z},\mathbf{x}_k)+2$.

Indeed, since $d_{k+1}(\mathbf{z}^{(1)},\mathbf{x}_{k+1})\geq d_k(\mathbf{z},\mathbf{x}_k)>M$, $\mathbf{z}^{(1)}\notin\mathcal{F}_{k+1}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1})$. Moreover, the canonical geodesic $\pi(\mathbf{z}^{(1)},\mathbf{x}_{k+1})$ is not horizontal, which implies that $\mathbf{z}$ and $\mathbf{x}_k$ are in the vertical segment of $\pi(\mathbf{z}^{(1)},\mathbf{x}_{k+1})$. Hence $d(\mathbf{z}^{(1)},\mathbf{x}_{k+1})=d(\mathbf{z},\mathbf{x}_k)+2$, and this proves the claim. Similarly we have $\mathbf{z}^{(1)}\notin\mathcal{F}_{k+1}(\mathbf{y}_{k+1})$.

Let $\mathcal{J}_n(\mathbf{z})$ the the set of n-th descendants of $\mathbf{z}$ in $\mathcal{J}_{k+n}$. It follows from the claim that $\Phi(\mathbf{z}^{(1)})=\lambda r^\alpha\Phi(\mathbf{z})$, $\mathbf{z}\in\mathcal{F}_k^c$, and hence inductively,

$$\Phi(\mathbf{z}^{(n)})=(\lambda r^\alpha)^n\Phi(\mathbf{z}),\qquad \mathbf{z}\in\mathcal{F}_k^c,\quad \mathbf{z}^{(n)}\in\mathcal{J}_n(\mathbf{z}). \tag{6.7}$$

Also by the same proof as Lemma 3.1, we have

$$r^{-\alpha n}\leq\#\mathcal{J}_n(\mathbf{z})\leq r^{-\alpha(n+1)}. \tag{6.8}$$

Choose n_0 such that $\delta=r^{-\alpha}\lambda^{n_0}<1$. It follows from (6.6)-(6.8) that for any $k\geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{J}_{k+n_0}}\Phi(\mathbf{w})&=\Big(\sum_{\mathbf{z}\in\mathcal{F}_k^c}\sum_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{J}_{n_0}(\mathbf{z})}+\sum_{\mathbf{z}\in\mathcal{F}_k(\mathbf{x}_k)}\sum_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{J}_{n_0}(\mathbf{z})}+\sum_{\mathbf{z}\in\mathcal{F}_k(\mathbf{y}_k)}\sum_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{J}_{n_0}(\mathbf{z})}\Big)\Phi(\mathbf{w})\\&\leq r^{-\alpha}\lambda^{n_0}\sum_{\mathbf{z}\in\mathcal{F}_k^c}\Phi(\mathbf{z})+r^{-\alpha(n_0+1)}\Big(\sum_{\mathbf{z}\in\mathcal{F}_k(\mathbf{x}_k)}+\sum_{\mathbf{z}\in\mathcal{F}_k(\mathbf{y}_k)}\Big)(\lambda r^\alpha)^{-(\xi|\eta)}\\&\leq\delta\sum_{\mathbf{z}\in\mathcal{J}_k}\Phi(\mathbf{z})+C_2(\lambda r^\alpha)^{-(\xi|\eta)},\end{aligned}$$

By iteration, we have for any integer $\ell\geq 1$, and any $k\in\{1,2,\cdots,n_0\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{J}_{k+n_0\ell}}\Phi(\mathbf{w})&\leq\delta^\ell\sum_{\mathbf{z}\in\mathcal{J}_k}\Phi(\mathbf{z})+\frac{C_2}{1-\delta}(\lambda r^\alpha)^{-(\xi|\eta)}\\&\leq\left(\#\mathcal{J}_k+\frac{C_2}{1-\delta}\right)\cdot(\lambda r^\alpha)^{-(\xi|\eta)}\quad\text{(by (6.6))}\\&\leq\left(\#\mathcal{J}_{n_0}+\frac{C_2}{1-\delta}\right)\cdot(\lambda r^\alpha)^{-(\xi|\eta)}.\end{aligned}$$

This completes the upper estimation of $\Theta(\xi,\eta)$. □

We remark that for homogeneous IFS, the SRW is a special example of λ-NRW with $\lambda=1/N=r^\alpha$. Hence by Theorem 6.3, $\Theta(\xi,\eta)\asymp|\xi-\eta|^{-2\alpha}$. Also for

Example 3.7, we identify the two end points on the unit interval to get a circle. The above theorem (with slight adjustment) shows that the SRW there has Naim kernel $\Theta(\xi,\eta) \asymp |\xi-\eta|^{-2}$, which resembles the classical case of the kernel of the Douglas integral on the unit circle.

We also remark that there is an analogous result for the more general random walks on N-ary trees investigated by Kigami [Ki2]. For the λ-QNRW on the N-homogeneous tree T defined by a set of probability weights $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^N$, the effective resistance between $\mathbf{x} \in T$ and $\Sigma_{\mathbf{x}}$ with respect to the sub-tree $T_{\mathbf{x}}$ is $R_{\mathbf{x}} = \lambda^{|\mathbf{x}|+1}/((1-\lambda)p_{\mathbf{x}})$, which can be derived from the combined resistance by iteration. Since the hitting distribution ν is the self-similar measure of $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^N$ on the Cantor set Σ^∞ as Martin boundary, we have $\nu(\Sigma_{\mathbf{x}}^\infty) = p_{\mathbf{x}}$. In the notation of [Ki2], $D_{\mathbf{x}} := \nu(\Sigma_{\mathbf{x}}^\infty)R_{\mathbf{x}} = \lambda^{|\mathbf{x}|+1}/(1-\lambda)$ and $\lambda_{\mathbf{x}} = 1/D_{\mathbf{x}} = (1-\lambda)/\lambda^{|\mathbf{x}|+1}$. Following [Ki2, Theorem 5.6], we can write the jump kernel $J(\xi,\eta)$ for such λ-QNRW as

$$J(\xi,\eta) = \frac{1-\lambda}{2\lambda}\Big(1 + \sum_{m=1}^{(\xi|\eta)} \frac{1-\lambda}{\lambda^m p_{[\xi,\eta]_m}}\Big) \asymp \lambda^{-(\xi|\eta)} p_{[\xi,\eta]}^{-1}, \quad \xi,\eta \in \Sigma^\infty, \tag{6.9}$$

where $[\xi,\eta]_m$ is the unique word in Σ^m such that both ξ and η belong to $\Sigma_{[\xi,\eta]_m}$, and $[\xi,\eta] := [\xi,\eta]_{(\xi|\eta)}$. In particular, for the λ-NRW on the N-homogeneous tree, $p_{\mathbf{x}} = N^{-|\mathbf{x}|}$, and we have the following estimate:

$$J(\xi,\eta) = \frac{(1-\lambda)(N-1)}{2(N-\lambda)} + \frac{N(1-\lambda)^2(N/\lambda)^{(\xi|\eta)}}{2\lambda(N-\lambda)} \asymp (N/\lambda)^{(\xi|\eta)} = (\lambda r^\alpha)^{-(\xi|\eta)}, \tag{6.10}$$

where $\alpha = |\log N/\log r|$ is the Hausdorff dimension of the Cantor set Σ^∞. It coincides with Theorem 6.3.

7 Induced Dirichlet forms

In this section we use the λ-NRW and the Naim kernel to induce an energy form on K, and make some remarks on the known results for such form to be a Dirichlet form. First we summarize some general results that hold for all transient reversible random walks.

Let $(X,\mathfrak{E})$ be a graph that is countably infinite, connected and locally finite and let $\{Z_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ be a transient reversible random walk on (X,E) with conductance c and total conductance m. The *graph energy* of a (real) function f on X is defined to be

$$\mathcal{E}_X[f] = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{x,y\in X, x\sim y} c(x,y)(f(x)-f(y))^2.$$

We let $\mathcal{D}_X$, the domain of $\mathcal{E}_X$, be the set of f with $\mathcal{E}_X[f] < \infty$. Since $P(x,y) = c(x,y)/m(x)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_X[f] &= \frac{1}{2}\sum_{x\in X} m(x) \sum_{y\in X, y\sim x} P(x,y)(f(y)-f(x))^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\sum_{x\in X} m(x)\mathbb{E}_x[(f(Z_1)-f(Z_0))^2]. \end{aligned} \tag{7.1}$$

The graph energy defines a non-negative definite symmetric form $\mathcal{E}_X(f,g)$ on $\mathcal{D}_X$ by polarization. Moreover, if we fix any $x_0 \in X$, then $\mathcal{D}_X$ is a Hilbert space under the inner product

$$\langle f, g\rangle_0 := f(x_0)g(x_0) + \mathcal{E}_X(f,g), \quad f, g \in \mathcal{D}_X,$$

and the convergence in $(\mathcal{D}_X, \mathcal{E}_X)$ implies pointwise convergence [Wo1, Lemma 2.4].

Proposition 7.1. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be the Martin boundary of $\{Z_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$, and let $\nu = \nu_\vartheta$ be the hitting distribution. Suppose $f \in \mathcal{D}_X$ and is harmonic. Then $\{f(Z_n)\}_{n=0}^\infty$ converges almost surely and in L^2, and there exists $u \in L^2(\mathcal{M},\nu)$ such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} f(Z_n) = u(Z_\infty)$. Moreover, u is unique ν-a.e., and $f = Hu$ where*

$$Hu(x) = \int_{\mathcal{M}} u(\xi)K(x,\xi)\,d\nu(\xi), \quad x \in X.$$

Proof. The first was actually proved in [ALP, Theorem 1.1] without the assumption that f is harmonic. We only need this result when f is harmonic, and the proof is easy for this case. Fix $x \in X$, we claim that $\mathbb{E}_x[f(Z_n)^2]$ is bounded. Since $f(Z_n)$ is a martingale, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_x[f(Z_n)^2] &\le f(x)^2 + \sum_{k=1}^\infty \mathbb{E}_x\big[(f(Z_k)-f(Z_{k-1}))^2\big] \\ &= f(x)^2 + \sum_{k=1}^\infty \sum_{y\in X} P^k(x,y)\mathbb{E}_y\big[(f(Z_1)-f(Z_0))^2\big] \\ &= f(x)^2 + \sum_{y\in X} G(x,y)\mathbb{E}_y\big[(f(Z_1)-f(Z_0))^2\big].\end{aligned}$$

By the reversibility of $P(x,y)$, we have $G(x,y) = \frac{m(y)}{m(x)}G(y,x) \le \frac{m(y)}{m(x)}F(y,x)G(x,x) \le \frac{m(y)}{m(x)}G(x,x)$. So, by (7.1) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_x[f(Z_n)^2] &\le f(x)^2 + \frac{G(x,x)}{m(x)}\sum_{y\in X} m(y)\mathbb{E}_y[(f(Z_1)-f(Z_0))^2] \\ &= f(x)^2 + 2\frac{G(x,x)}{m(x)}\,\mathcal{E}_X[f],\end{aligned}$$

and the claim follows. Since f is harmonic, $\{f(Z_n)\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is a martingale under $\mathbb{P}_x$. It follows that $\{f(Z_n)\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is an L^2-bounded martingale under $\mathbb{P}_x$. The martingale convergence theorem implies the almost surely convergence and convergence in L^2.

Let $Y = \lim_{n\to\infty} f(Z_n)$. Note that Y is a *final* random variable, i.e. $Y \circ \theta = Y$ a.s. where θ is the shift operator. Hence there exists a measurable function u on $\mathcal{M}$ such that $Y = u(Z_\infty)$ a.s. (under any $\mathbb{P}_x$) (see [Dy]). It is clear that u is unique ν-a.e. Now since $Y \in L^2(\mathbb{P}_\vartheta)$, we have

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}} u(\xi)^2 d\nu(\xi) = \mathbb{E}_\vartheta(u(Z_\infty)^2) = \mathbb{E}_\vartheta(Y^2) < \infty.$$

That $f = Hu$ follows from

$$f(Z_n) = \mathbb{E}[u(Z_\infty)|\mathcal{F}_n] = \mathbb{E}[u(Z_\infty)|Z_n] = \mathbb{E}_{Z_n}[u(Z_\infty)] = Hu(Z_n),$$

and irreducibility of the chain. □

For a reversible random walk on $(X, \mathfrak{E})$, the energy form induces a bilinear form $(\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D}_\mathcal{M})$ on $L^2(\mathcal{M}, \nu)$ defined by

$$\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{M}(u, v) = \mathcal{E}_X(Hu, Hv), \quad u, v \in \mathcal{D}_\mathcal{M}, \tag{7.2}$$

where $\mathcal{D}_\mathcal{M} = \{u \in L^2(\mathcal{M}, \nu) : Hu \in \mathcal{D}_X\}$ is the domain of $\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{M}$. It follows from Proposition 7.1 that $\mathcal{D}_\mathcal{M} = \{u \in L^2(\mathcal{M}, \nu) : \exists \text{ harmonic } f \in \mathcal{D}_X \text{ s.t. } u(Z_\infty) = \lim_{n\to\infty} f(Z_n) \text{ a.s.}\}$.

Theorem 7.2. (Silverstein [Si]) *The induced bilinear form $(\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D}_\mathcal{M})$ has the expression*

$$\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{M}[u] = \mathcal{E}_X[Hu] = \frac{1}{2} m(\vartheta) \int_\mathcal{M} \int_\mathcal{M} (u(\xi) - u(\eta))^2 \Theta(\xi, \eta) d\nu(\xi) d\nu(\eta), \quad u \in \mathcal{D}_\mathcal{M},$$

where $\Theta(\xi, \eta)$ is the Naim kernel defined in (6.3)*. Moreover, $\mathcal{D}_\mathcal{M} = \{u \in L^2(\mathcal{M}, \mu) : \mathcal{E}_\mathcal{M}[u] < \infty\}$.*

As a direct consequence of the above and Theorem 6.3, we have

Theorem 7.3. *Let $\{S_i\}_{i=1}^N$ be an IFS on $\mathbb{R}^d$ that satisfies the OSC, and let K be the self-similar set. Let $\{Z_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ be a λ-NRW on the augmented tree $(X, \mathfrak{E})$. Then*

$$\mathcal{E}_K[u] \asymp \int_K \int_K (u(\xi) - u(\eta))^2 \ |\xi - \eta|^{-(\alpha+\beta)} d\nu(\xi) d\nu(\eta), \quad u \in \mathcal{D}_K,$$

where $\alpha = \dim_H K$, and $\beta = \frac{\log \lambda}{\log r}$.

Next we recall the definitions of Dirichlet form on $L^2(\mathfrak{X};\mu)$ (see [FOT], [CF]). Let $\mathfrak{X}$ be a locally compact separable metric space together with μ a positive Radon measure such that $\mathrm{supp}(\mu) = \mathfrak{X}$, and let $C_0(\mathfrak{X})$ denote the space of continuous function on $\mathfrak{X}$ with compact support. We say a bilinear form $\mathcal{E}(\cdot,\cdot)$ is a *symmetric form* on $L^2(\mathfrak{X};\mu)$ if $\mathcal{E}$ is symmetric and non-negative definite, and is defined on a dense subspace $\mathcal{D}$ of $L^2(\mathfrak{X};\mu)$. A symmetric form $(\mathcal{E},\mathcal{D})$ is called *closed* if the domain $\mathcal{D}$ is a Hilbert space with the inner product induced by $\mathcal{E}_1(\cdot,\cdot) = \mathcal{E}(\cdot,\cdot)+(\cdot,\cdot)_{L^2(\mathfrak{X};\mu)}$, and is called *Markovian* if $u \in \mathcal{D}$ implies $v = (0 \vee u) \wedge 1 \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{E}[v] \le \mathcal{E}[u]$.

Definition 7.4. *A Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E},\mathcal{D})$ on $L^2(\mathfrak{X};\mu)$ is a closed Markovian symmetric form on $L^2(\mathfrak{X};\mu)$. It is called* regular *if the subspace $\mathcal{D}\cap C_0(\mathfrak{X})$ is dense in $\mathcal{D}$ with the $\mathcal{E}_1$-norm, and is dense in $C_0(\mathfrak{X})$ with the supremum norm. It is called* local *if for two functions $u, v \in \mathcal{D}$ having disjoint compact supports, $\mathcal{E}(u,v) = 0$.*

It is easy to see that the bilinear form $\mathcal{E}_K(\cdot,\cdot)$ in Theorem 7.3 is symmetric, non-negative definite, closed and Markovian. In order for it to be a Dirichlet form, we need to show that its domain $\mathcal{D}_K$ is dense in $L^2(K,\nu)$. In view of the fact that the Naim kernel in Theorem 7.3 satisfies the estimate $\Theta(\xi,\eta) \asymp |\xi-\eta|^{-(\alpha+\beta)}$, we introduce the following Besov space consideration on $L^2(\mathfrak{X},\mu)$ (see [J], [St], [GHL1], [GHL2] and [HK]).

For convenience, we assume that $\mathfrak{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and is equipped with the Euclidean distance; we also assume that $\mathfrak{X}$ has Hausdorff dimension α, and $\mu(B(x;r)) \asymp r^\alpha$ for all $x \in \mathfrak{X}$ and $0 < r < 1$. We call such $\mathfrak{X}$ an α-set [JW]. For $\sigma > 0$, and for $u \in L^2(\mathfrak{X};\mu)$, we define

$$\mathcal{N}_{2,2}^{\alpha,\sigma}(u) = \int_0^\infty \frac{dr}{r}\frac{1}{r^{\alpha+2\sigma}} \iint\limits_{\{\xi,\eta\in\mathfrak{X}:|\xi-\eta|<r\}} (u(\xi)-u(\eta))^2 d\mu(\xi)d\mu(\eta). \tag{7.3}$$

We define the *Besov spaces* $\Lambda_{2,2}^{\alpha,\sigma} = \{u \in L^2(\mathfrak{X};\mu) : \mathcal{N}_{2,2}^{\alpha,\sigma}(u) < \infty\}$ with the associated norms $\|u\|^2_{\Lambda_{2,2}^{\alpha,\sigma}} = \|u\|_2^2 + \mathcal{N}_{2,2}^{\alpha,\sigma}(u)$. The space can be trivial when σ is a large value; for example, in Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^d$, $\Lambda_{2,2}^{n,1} = \{0\}$. We introduce an important quantity $\beta^* \in [0,+\infty]$ which is intrinsic to the underlying space $\mathfrak{X}$ ([St], [GHL1]):

$$\beta^* := \sup\{\beta > 0 : \Lambda_{2,2}^{\alpha,\beta/2} \text{ is dense in } L^2(\mathfrak{X},\nu)\} \tag{7.4}$$

It is called the *critical exponent* of the family $\left\{\Lambda_{2,2}^{\alpha,\beta/2}\right\}_{\beta>0}$. The value of β^* is already known for some standard cases. For the Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^n$, we have $\alpha = n, \beta^* = 2$. For d-dimensional Sierpinski gasket, then $\alpha = \log(d+1)/\log 2$, and $\beta^* = \log(d+3)/\log 2$ [J]. There are also extensions on nested fractals on the related Besov spaces ([P1], [P2]), and evaluation of some other specific cases [Ku].

For Cantor-type set as the boundary of an infinite binary tree, it follows from [Ki2, Theorem 5.6] that $\beta^* = \infty$. In general, we know that if a metric measure space $(\mathfrak{X}, d, \mu)$ satisfies $\mu(B(x;r)) \asymp r^\alpha$ for all $x \in \mathfrak{X}$ and $0 < r < 1$, then $\beta^* \geq 2$. If in addition $\mathfrak{X}$ satisfies *the chain condition*, then $\beta^* \leq \alpha + 1$ [GHL1].

Continuing the statement in Theorem 7.3, we have the following conclusion.

Theorem 7.5. *With the same assumption and notations as in Theorem 7.3, then*

$$\mathcal{E}_K[u] \asymp \mathcal{N}_{2,2}^{\alpha,\beta/2}(u), \quad u \in \mathcal{D}_K, \tag{7.5}$$

and $\mathcal{D}_K$ is the Besov space $\Lambda_{2,2}^{\alpha,\beta/2}$. Therefore, if $\beta < \beta^*$, then $(\mathcal{E}_K, \mathcal{D}_K)$ is a non-local Dirichlet form on $L^2(K;\nu)$.

The proof of (7.5) and that $\mathcal{D}_K$ is the Besov space $\Lambda_{2,2}^{\alpha,\beta/2}$ is in [St]. For the regularity of the Dirichlet form, we summarize as

Proposition 7.6. *Let $\{S_i\}_{i=1}^N$ be an IFS of contractive similitudes with the OSC, and let K be the self-similar set. For a λ-NRW on the augmented tree $(X, \mathfrak{E})$, if either (i) $\lambda \in (r^2, 1)$, or (ii) $\alpha < \beta^*$ and $\lambda \in (r^{\beta^*}, r^\alpha)$, then the induced form $(\mathcal{E}_K, \mathcal{D}_K)$ is a regular non-local Dirichlet form on $L^2(K, \nu)$.*

Moreover, if $2 \leq \alpha < \beta^*$ and $\lambda \in [r^\alpha, r^2]$, let $\mathcal{D}_K^* = \overline{C(K) \cap \mathcal{D}_K}$, where the closure is taken under the norm $||\cdot||_{\Lambda_{2,2}^{\alpha,\beta/2}}$. Then $(\mathcal{E}_k, \mathcal{D}_K^*)$ is a regular non-local Dirichlet form on $L^2(K, \nu)$.

Proof. It is well-known that K equipped with Euclidean metric and α-Hausdorff measure is a d-set with $d = \alpha$. As $2 \leq \beta^*$ [GHL1], the assumption $\lambda \in (r^2, 1)$ in (i) implies $0 < \beta < 2 (\leq \beta^*)$. It follows from [St, Theorem 3] that the Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}_K, \mathcal{D}_K)$ is regular.

For (ii), we have $\alpha < \beta < \beta^*$, and the domain $\mathcal{D}_K$ is embedded into the Lipschitz space of Hölder exponent $(\beta - \alpha)/2$. Hence $(\mathcal{E}_K, \mathcal{D}_K)$ is regular [HK, Proposition 3.2].

For the last part, we have $2 \leq \beta \leq \alpha < \beta^*$. Let $\beta_0 = (\alpha + \beta^*)/2$. Then $\alpha < \beta_0 < \beta^*$. Hence by the above paragraph, $\mathcal{D}_K^{(\beta_0)}$ are Lipschitz functions of order $(\beta_0 - \alpha)/2$, and $\mathcal{D}_K^{(\beta_0)} = C(K) \cap \mathcal{D}_K^{(\beta_0)} \subset C(K) \cap \mathcal{D}_K \subset \mathcal{D}_K^*$. This implies that $C(K) \cap \mathcal{D}_K$ is dense in $L^2(K, \nu)$ and in $C(K)$, and $(\mathcal{E}_k, \mathcal{D}_K^*)$ is regular. □

We remark that in the proof of the last part, we cannot prove $C(K) \cap \mathcal{D}_K$ is dense in $\mathcal{D}_K$ with the $\mathcal{E}_1$-norm. Hence we use $\mathcal{D}_K^* = \overline{C(K) \cap \mathcal{D}_K}$ instead of the original $\mathcal{D}_K$. Also we do not know the regularity of the Dirichlet form for $2 \leq \beta < \beta^* \leq \alpha$.

By [FOT, Theorems 7.2.1 and 7.2.2], we know that a regular Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}_K, \mathcal{D}_K)$ on $L^2(K,\nu)$ generates an associated Hunt jump process with transition density function (heat kernel) $p(t,\xi,\eta)$. For $0<\beta<2$, i.e., $\lambda \in (r^2,1)$, it has been shown in [CK] that the heat kernel satisfies the following estimate:

$$p(t,\xi,\eta) \asymp \min\Big\{t^{-\alpha/\beta},\ \frac{t}{|\xi-\eta|^{\alpha+\beta}}\Big\}, \quad \xi,\eta\in K,\ 0<t\le 1.$$

We do not have the estimate of $p(t,\xi,\eta)$ for $\alpha<\beta<\beta^*$ or for other cases in general.

The Besov spaces at the critical exponent β^* is particularly important and is not clear. In fact there is another class of Besov spaces $\Lambda^{\alpha,\sigma}_{2,\infty}$ that is involved (see for example [GHL1]). For example on $\mathbb{R}^n$, $\beta^*=2$, and we have $\Lambda^{n,1}_{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^n)=\{0\}$, but $\Lambda^{n,1}_{2,\infty}$ equals the Sobolev space $W^1_2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, the domain of classical Dirichlet form that generates the Gaussian heat kernel. Similar situation holds for self-similar sets (and more general metric measure spaces) that admit local Dirichlet forms and subgaussian kernels [GHL1]. In an upcoming paper, we will give a more detailed discussion, and provide a criterion to determine the exponent β^*.

Acknowledgements: The authors would like to thank Professors A. Grigoryan, J.X. Hu, J. Kigami and T. Kumagai for many valuable discussions and suggesting some references. They also thank Professor S.M. Ngai for going through the manuscript carefully. Part of the work was carried out while the second author was visiting the University of Pittsburgh, he is grateful to Professors C. Lennard and J. Manfredi for the arrangement of the visit.

References

[An1] A. Ancona, *Negatively curved manifolds, elliptic operators, and the Martin boundary*, Ann. Math. 125 (1987), 495–536.

[An2] A. Ancona, *Positive harmonic functions and hyperbolicity*, Potential Theory: Surveys and Problems, Lecture Notes in Math. 1344, Springer, 1988, 1–23.

[ALP] A. Ancona, R. Lyons, Y. Peres, *Crossing estimates and convergence of Dirichlet functions along random walk and diffusion paths*, Ann. Probab. 27 (1999), 970–989.

[BJ] R. Bartle and J. Joichi, *The preservation of convergence of measuarble functions under composition*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 12 (1961), 122–126.

[CF] Z.Q. Chen and M. Fukushima, *Symmetric Markov Processes, time changes and boundary theory*, London Math. Soc. Mono. 35, Princeton U. Press, 2011

[CK] Z.Q. Chen and T. Kumagai, *Heat kernel estimates for stable-like processes on d-sets*, Stochastic Processes and their Applications, 108 (2003), 27–62.

[DS1] M. Denker and H. Sato, *Sierpiǹski gasket as a Martin boundary I: Martin kernel*, Potential Anal. 14 (2001), 211–232.

[DS2] M. Denker and H. Sato, *Sierpiǹski gasket as a Martin boundary II: The intrinsic metric*, Publ. RIMS, Kyoto Univ. 35 (1999), 769–794.

[DS3] M. Denker and H. Sato, *Reflections on harmonic analysis of the Sierpiǹski gasket*, Math. Nachr. 241 (2002), 32–55.

[Dy] E. Dynkin, *Boundary theory of Markov processes (the disrete case)*, Russian Math. Surveys, 24 (1969), 1–42.

[F] K. Falconer, *Fractal Geometry. Mathematical Foundations and Applications*, John Wiley and Sons, Ltd., Chichester, 1990.

[FOT] M. Fukushima, Y. Oshima and M. Takeda, *Dirichlet forms and symmetric Markov processes*, de Gruyter Studies in Mathematics 19, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 1994.

[G] M. Gromov, *Hyperbolic groups*, Essays in group theory, Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ., 8, Springer, New York, 1987, 75–263.

[GHL1] A. Grigor'yan, J. Hu, and K.-S. Lau, *Heat kernels on metric-mearsure spaces and an application to semilinear elliptic equations*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 355 (2003), 2065–2095.

[GHL2] A. Grigor'yan, J. Hu, and K.-S. Lau, *Heat kernels on metric spaces*, in Geometry and Anaysis of Fractals, Springer Proc. Math. Stat. 88, Springer, Heidelberg, 2014, 147–207.

[GHL3] A. Grigor'yan, J. Hu, and K.-S. Lau, *Estimates of heat kernels for non-local regular Dirichlet forms*, Tran. Amer. Math. Soc. 366 (2014), 6397–6441.

[HK] J.X. Hu, T. Kumagai, *Nash-type inequalities and heat kernels for non-local Dirichlet forms*, Kyushu J. Math. 60 (2006), pp. 245–265.

[J] A. Jonsson, *Brownian motion on fractals and function spaces*, Math. Zeit., 222 (1996), pp. 495–504.

[JW] A. Jonsson and H. Wallin, *Function spaces on subsets of R^n*, Math. Reports, 2, Part 1 (1984).

[JLW] H. Ju, K.S. Lau and X.Y. Wang, *Post-critcally finite fractal and Martin boundary*, Tran. Amer. Math. Soc. 364 (2012), 103–118.

[Ka] V. Kaimanovich, *Random walks on Sierpinski graphs: hyperbolicity and stochastic homogenization*, Fractals in Graz 2001, Trends Math., Birkhuser, Basel, 2003, 145–183.

[Ki1] J. Kigami, *Analysis on Fractals*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics 143, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001.

[Ki2] J. Kigami, *Dirichlet forms and associated heat kernels on the Cantor set induced by random walks on trees*, Adv. Math. 225 (2010), 2674–2730.

[Ku] T. Kumagai, *Estimates of transition densities for Brownian motion on nested fractals*, Probab. Theory Relat. Fields 96, 205-224 (1993).

[LN1] K.S. Lau and S.M. Ngai, *Martin boundary and exit space on the Sierpinski gasket*, Sci. China Math. 55 (2012), 475–494.

[LN2] K.S. Lau and S.M. Ngai, *Boundary theory on Hata tree*, Nonlinear Analysis 95 (2014), 292–307.

[LW1] K.S. Lau, X.Y. Wang, *Self-similar sets as hyperbolic boundaries*, Indiana Univ. Math. J., 58 (2009), 1777–1795.

[LW2] K.S. Lau, X.Y. Wang, *Denker-Sato type Markov chains on self-similar sets*, Math. Zeit. 280(2015), 401–420.

[LW3] K.S. Lau, X.Y. Wang, *On hyperbolic graphs induced by iterated function systems*, preprint, 2016.

[Na] L. Naim, *Sur le role de la frontiere de R. S. Martin dans la theorie du potentiel*, Ann. Inst. Fourier, 7 (1957), 183–281.

[Ne] V. Nekrashevych, *Self-similar groups*, Math. Surveys & Monog. vol 117, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 2005

[P1] K. Pietruska-Paluba, *Some function spaces related to the brownian motion on simple nested fractals*, Stochastics and Stochastics Reports, 1999, Vol. 67: 267–285.

[P2] K. Pietruska-Paluba, *On function spaces related to fractional diffusions on d-sets*, Stochastics and Stochastics Reports, 2000, Vol. 70, 153–164.

[Sc] A. Schief, *Seperation properties for self-similar sets*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 122 (1994), 111–115.

[Si] M. Silverstein, *Classification of stable symmetric Markov chains*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 24 (1974), 29–77.

[St] A. Stós, *Symmetric α-stable processes on d-sets*, Bull. Polish Acad. Sci. Math. 48 (2000), 237–245.

[Str] R. S. Strichartz, *Differential equations on fractals*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2006.

[Wo1] W. Woess, *Random Walks on Infinite Graphs and Groups*, Cambridge U. Press, Cambridge, 2000.

[Wo2] W. Woess, *Denumerable Markov Chains*, European Math. Soc., Switzerland, 2009.

[Y] P.L. Yung, *Doubling properties of self-similar measures*, Indiana U. Math. J. 56 (2007), 965–990.

Department of Mathematics, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong
slkong@math.cuhk.edu.hk

Department of Mathematics, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong
kslau@math.cuhk.edu.hk

Department of Mathematics, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195 USA
wongting@uw.edu